Rev. C. H. Steinle
With thanks for aid, from
Marie E. Richard.

THE CONFESSIONAL HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH

BY

JAMES W. RICHARD, D. D., LL. D.

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
WITHDRAWN
LIBRARY
1962

PUBLISHED FOR THE AUTHOR
BY THE
LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

BX8018
.R38

Copyright, 1909,
by
Marie E. Richard.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

WITHDRAWN

PREFACE

THE sad service, and yet a privilege, was assigned me by the author of this volume to preface his work by a few words expressive of the conditions of its issue.

Professor Richard, after a brief yet severe illness lasting but five days, passed away, March 7th, from earthly labor in the full vigor of mental and physical life. Only one-half of the proof matter of the volume received his personal examination and correction before his death.

This volume is the *finis* as well as the ripe fruit of his studies for twenty years in this department of scholarly research.

It was the intention of the author to append to his volume a bibliography of the literature pertaining to this subject, and consulted by him in its preparation ; but his sudden removal by death precluded the execution of the purpose. Fully two hundred volumes, chiefly Latin and German, were consulted, all of which are in the libraries of the Theological Seminary and of Pennsylvania College, save about twenty volumes, some not purchasable and borrowed, and several examined in the library of the University of Leipzig.

It would doubtless have been a great pleasure to the author to read the reviews and criticisms of his work, and to elucidate and substantiate the claims resulting from his researchful labors. But he has now left the truth to vindicate itself on the pages of history. He labored to reach objective facts, and to relate them according to his consciousness of historic verity, a consciousness illumined by wide researches.

The loss to the Theological Seminary of his living personality can only in part be compensated by a wide circle of readers who may be interested in this historic subject, and desire to be profited by his fruitful investigations and his gift of creedal discipline.

Recognition is due Professors J. O. Evjen and K. J. Grimm for their kind service of final proof reading and critical suggestions.

M. COOVER.

GETTYSBURG, PA.,
April 26, 1909.

619

In aeternum historiae veritas colenda est.

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE GERMAN REFORMATION 1

CHAPTER II.

THE DIET AT AUGSBURG IN THE YEAR 1530 24

CHAPTER III.

THE JOURNEY TO AUGSBURG 36

CHAPTER IV.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION 46

CHAPTER V.

THE MATERIALS USED IN COMPOSING THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION . 61

CHAPTER VI.

THE DELIVERY OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION 74

CHAPTER VII.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION 92

CHAPTER VIII.

ANALYSIS OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION. 104

CHAPTER IX.

THE CATHOLIC CONFUTATION 123

PAGE

CHAPTER X.

Efforts at Reconciliation 138

CHAPTER XI.

Efforts at Reconciliation.—Continued 157

CHAPTER XII.

The Efforts at Reconciliation.—Concluded 170

CHAPTER XIII.

Luther's Relations to the Augsburg Confession 194

CHAPTER XIV.

The Melanchthon Editions of the Augsburg Confession . . . 209

CHAPTER XV.

The Augsburg Confession from 1530 to 1555. 234

CHAPTER XVI.

The Other Old Lutheran Confessions 255

CHAPTER XVII.

The Old Lutheran Confessions as Ecclesiastical Symbols to 1555 276

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Old Lutheran Confessions as Symbols from 1555 to 1580 . 289

CHAPTER XIX.

The Controversies Within the Lutheran Church: In General. 311

CHAPTER XX.

The Anthropological Controversy 333

PAGE

CHAPTER XXI.

The Christological Controversy 372

CHAPTER XXII.

The Soteriological Controversy 386

CHAPTER XXIII.

Efforts at Pacification 400

CHAPTER XXIV.

The Torgau Book 418

CHAPTER XXV.

The Authors of the Torgau Book 432

CHAPTER XXVI.

The Censures of the Torgau Book 452

CHAPTER XXVII.

The Bergic Book 469

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Subscription to the Formula of Concord. 491

CHAPTER XXIX.

The Book of Concord 519

CHAPTER XXX.

The Symbolical Books in the Era of Pietism, of Philosophy and of Rationalism 546

PAGE

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE CONFESSIONS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY 571

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE CONFESSIONS IN AMERICA 601

THE CONFESSIONAL HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE GERMAN REFORMATION.

THE German Reformation of the sixteenth century was one of the greatest movements recorded in history. But it cannot be said that this great movement began on this or on that day, or that its existence is due to this or to that event, or to one or to another man. It was a phenomenon of the times. John Wyclif was its morning star. John Huss and Jerome of Prague were its proto-martyrs. Savonarola was its prophet. The posting of the Ninety-five Theses on the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg, October 31, 1517, was an incident, or one link in a long chain of events. The minds of multitudes of the German people were in a condition to understand and to interpret a challenge of ecclesiastical affairs as they then existed. The hierarchy had become intolerably oppressive. The priesthood was corrupt. Millions of German gold had been carried across the Alps to support the profligate extravagance of the Vatican. A third, perhaps a half, of all the real estate was in the hands of the Church. One person out of every seventeen belonged to one or another of the religious orders. Money was demanded for baptism, for marriage, for extreme unction, for burial; and now, perhaps more shamelessly than ever before, indulgences for permission to sin were sold to raise more money to be sent to Rome.

The Ninety-five Theses came at the opportune moment. Had they appeared one hundred years earlier, their author would, undoubtedly, have been led to the stake for daring to call in question the divine right of the Pope to forgive sins. The cry of "heresy," potent still, is not so potent as it was at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The one hundred and two years

that intervened between the burning of John Huss at Constance and the posting of the Ninety-five Theses at Wittenberg had witnessed a vast expansion of the intellectual horizon in Germany. The Renaissance, which is not only the re-birth of literature and art, but is chiefly the transition from the mediæval to the modern world, had crossed the Alps, and had found a welcome home among the sturdy sons of the North. For Germany, the fifteenth century was the century of the founding of universities. Besides Vienna, Heidelberg, Cologne and Erfurt, founded in the fourteenth century, we now have Leipzig in 1409, Rostock in 1419, Cracow in 1420, Greifswald in 1456, Freiburg and Trier in 1457, Basel in 1460, Ingolstadt in 1472, Tübingen and Mayence in 1477, Wittenberg in 1502, Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1507.

Knowledge was running to and fro. In the German universities the poetry, oratory, philosophy and science of ancient Greece and Rome were now cultivated as scarcely anywhere else in the world, and were turned to the behoof of the Christian religion. Thousands of young men were speaking the language of Cicero and were reciting the verses of Virgil, Horace and Terence, and were beginning to drink deep from Pierian and Castalian springs. Even the cities were vieing with each other in establishing free schools for the education of their future citizens. Nor were the girls to be neglected. Already in the fifteenth century a high school for girls, with learned ladies, who were not nuns, for teachers, was established in Frankfort. In the same century also came the printing-press, which at once began to serve the cause of the Gospel. In 1455 the Bible was printed in Latin. From 1462 to 1518 not less than fourteen editions of the Bible were printed in High German, and from 1480 to 1522 four editions in Low German. In 1477 the Hebrew Psalter was printed, and in 1488 the entire Hebrew Bible. In 1516 the New Testament in Greek was printed at Basel, and in 1520-22 appeared the famous Complutensian Polyglot.

Thus the fountains of wisdom, both profane and sacred, were opened to the learned and to the unlearned. As a result, Germany had risen to a higher self-consciousness. The people were thinking for themselves and were thinking by means of the great thoughts contained in the old classics and in the Divine Word. Indeed, Germany had now laid those foundations of science and culture on which she has erected herself into the school-house of the nations. The old régime could not satisfy the new condi-

tions. The age was sighing for deliverance from the bondage of the past, and was yearning for the freedom held out in the promise of the future.

But reformations are not wrought without human instrumentality. They await the coming of great and heroic souls who embody in themselves the experiences, the detestations, the aspirations, of their contemporaries. And among the great and heroic souls there must be one who is greatest, one who can command the confidence of others, one who by nature is endowed with the qualities of leadership.

1. *Martin Luther.*

Martin Luther was the greatest and the most heroic soul of the sixteenth century, one of the greatest and most heroic of all the centuries. He was great and heroic without knowing it, or without trying to be great and heroic. He was born with a great and heroic soul. The things he saw and felt and heard, the experience of divine grace in his heart, made him great and heroic—this Thuringian peasant's son, who had begged his bread in the streets of Eisenach, had tortured his body in the cloister at Erfurt, had observed the corruptions of the Church at Rome, and withal had learned that "God's righteousness is not that by which God punishes sinners and the unrighteous, but that by which the merciful God justifies us by faith," and that justification means the pardon of sins, and that grace means *misericordia Dei*, and that faith is confidence in the promise of God for the sake of Christ.

This was a new Gospel—rather was it the restoration of the Pauline interpretation of the Gospel—which had been preached and proclaimed by the fathers before the Christian Church had taken unto itself the rites of the Jewish and of the heathen altar, and which had not wholly died out from the Latin Church, though it had not been proclaimed in all its fullness and sweetness and power for a thousand years. But Luther did not state this Gospel as a dogma for the understanding. He grasped it as a living experience, as the power of God unto salvation. When now he sent it flying over the land in books and pamphlets and songs, the entire mass of the German people was put in motion. Some heard the message with joy and some with indignation, for all eyes were turned toward the monk of Wittenberg, who had declared war against the Pope, had confessed his doctrine before

an imperial diet, and had refused to recant unless he should be refuted out of the Divine Word.

A crisis had arisen in the Roman Catholic Church. The man of the triple crown was in danger of losing dominion over the fairest portion of Christendom. Mohammedanism had conquered almost the entire field of Oriental Christianity and the western shores of Africa, and had held Spain for more than seven hundred years. Shall heresy now claim the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation? The very thought is intolerable.

In 1520 the Pope issued the bull of excommunication against Martin Luther. In 1521 the Diet of Worms placed him under the ban of the Empire, and the Emperor declared that he would avenge the insult offered to the Apostolic See as though it had been done to himself. But the "heresy" spread so fast, and the arch-heretic made so many friends, that the Princes found it expedient to refrain from executing the edict. At Speyer in 1526 the heretic's friends were defiant, and displayed on their armorial bearings the motto: *Verbum Dei manet in æternum.* The Diet could only resolve that in matters appertaining to the Edict of Worms each Prince "should so live, govern, and carry himself as he hopes and trusts to answer to God and to his Imperial Majesty";* and the right was granted to each Prince to determine the affairs of religion in his own dominion according to his own views. Multitudes of the people had now espoused the "heresy," and Princes had taken it under their protection. The "heretic," who at Worms had stood alone, now had more real and true friends in Germany than the man of the triple crown at Rome. That is, the reformation of religion in Germany, which began, we scarcely know when, and had been preceded and promoted by events and conditions, we scarcely know how many, in less than nine years after the posting of the Ninety-five Theses, had advanced far in the direction of success. At least, till the close of the year 1526 foundations have been laid which have not to this day been shaken.

But in order to understand this reformation movement we must return to the man who was at once its most immediate cause and its leading spirit. In the year 1501 Martin Luther entered the University of Erfurt. Here he devoted himself chiefly to the reading of the Latin classics and to the study of the Aristotelian philosophy. Two years later, he was proclaimed Bachelor of

* Von Ranke, *History of the Reformation*, Bk. IV., Chap. III. St. Louis edition of *Luther's Schriften*, XVI., 210.

Philosophy, and in 1505, Magister. July 17, 1505, he entered the Augustinian cloister at Erfurt and devoted himself to the study of theology, with the Latin Bible and the tomes of William Occâm and Gabriel Biel as his chief text-books. In 1507 he was consecrated priest, and "received power to offer sacrifices for the living and the dead." In 1508 he was called to the chair of Philosophy in the University of Wittenberg, and was there enrolled anno 1508 thus: Fr. Martinus Luder de Mansfeld, admissus mox 1509 d. 9 Mart. Baccalaureus tamquam ad Biblia.* Here he lectured on the *Dialectics* and the *Physics* of Aristotle, the same whom he subsequently called *Damnatus*, because he taught that one must do good in order to become good. But even then he preferred theology, "that theology which examines the kernel of the nut, the fat of the wheat, the marrow of the bones." † In 1511 he went to Rome where he heard such "vulgarities" in the Mass as: "Bread thou art and bread thou wilt remain: wine thou art and wine thou wilt remain." In 1512 he was promoted to be doctor of theology, and bound himself to study and to teach the Holy Scriptures.‡ And now it was that he entered the career that made him the prince of Reformers. We soon find him lecturing on the Psalms and on the Epistle to the Romans, and studying Augustine more diligently than ever before. In opposition to Aristotle and the scholastic theology he exclaims: "Prior to all obedience the *person* must be acceptable, for God looked first

* Gieseler, *Church History*, IV., p. 17, note 4.

† De Wette, *Luther's Briefe*, I., p. 6.

‡ Walch, XVI., 1631. St Louis edition of *Luther's Schriften*, XVI., 1700. But Luther, at his promotion to the doctorate, took also the following oath: Ego .N. iuro domino Decano et Magistris facultatis Theologice Obedientiam et Reuerentiam debitam, Quod In quocumque statu vtilitatem Vniuersitatis et Maxime facultatis Theologice pro virili mea procurabo, Sed hunc gradum non reiterabo, Quod omnes Actus Theologicos exercebo In mitra (.Nisi fuerit religiosus.), vanas peregrinas doctrinas ab ecclesia dampnatas et piarum aurium offensiuas non dogmatisabo, Sed dogmatisantem domino Decano denunctiabo infra octendium, Quod manutenebo consuetudines, libertates et priuilegia Theologice facultatis pro virilj mea, Vt me deus adiuuet et sanctorum euangeliorum conditores. Quod, si fuerit Biblicus, interserat, Quod stabo integrum annum in Biblia (Nisi fuerit Religiosus, cuj Semestre deputamus), Quod singulis annis semel ordinarie respondebo, Et Decano Iubente sermonem faciam ad clerum, Et quod vltra caput lectionatim non absoluam. Si fuerit Sententiarius: Quod quemlibet librum solempniter auspicabor premissa oratione commendatitia sacre pagine, Necnon questione correspondente materie libri mej. Quod Tertium non incipiam, Nisi prius pecierim pro formatura et publice loco examinis responderim, Quod etiam duobus Annis in Sententijs perseuerabo. Si fuerit Licentiatus, Iuro etiam Romane ecclesie obedientiam, Et procurabo pacem inter Magistros et Scholasticos Seculares et Religiosos, Et pirhetum In nullo alio gymnasio recipiam. From *the Statuta Collegij Theologici* in Förstemann's *Liber Decanorum*, pp. 146-7. Luther's career from the year 1517 on is an instructive comment on this oath.

upon Abel and then upon his gift." On Psalm lxiv. 14, he wrote: "God will work justification. This operates against Aristotle, who wrote that we become righteous when we do righteous deeds. Much rather must a person be righteous before he can work righteousness." And May 18, 1516, he wrote to John Lange: "Aristotle is gradually going down, and will soon be overthrown, perhaps forever. The lectures on the Sententiaries are held in complete disgust. No one may hope for an audience who is not willing to teach this theology, that is, the Bible and Augustine, or some other doctor of authority in the Church."* And as at this time he came under the influence of Tauler and of the *Theologia Germanica,* he soon abandoned Scholasticism forever, and preached against indulgences in the confessional and on the pulpit. Finally, the Ninety-five Theses came, and a sermon on indulgences and grace.

Here were the words that spoke a new era into being and gave a new date to the history of the Church and of the world. Here the chief thoughts are that the Pope has no power to remit penalties except those which he himself has imposed by his own authority, and that "the true treasure of the Church is the Holy Gospel of the glory and grace of God." Jacob Hochstratten cried *Heresy.* Conrad Wimpina, Sylvester Prierias, John Eck and others entered the lists in defense of the old régime and of the traditional teaching. But the Wittenberg monk went on disputing, and writing, and publishing books, "compelled, *nolens, volens,* to become more learned every day, since so many great masters are urging me on and giving me practice," as he says of himself. In the year 1520 he sends forth his *Three Great Reformation Writings: To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation; Concerning Christian Liberty; On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church.*

In the first he batters down the three walls of the Romanists. The first wall is the claim that the spiritual power is superior to the temporal; the second is that no one may interpret the Scriptures except the Pope; the third is that no one may call a council except the Pope. The first wall is battered down by the doctrine that all Christians are priests, and that if a company of Christian laymen should be carried into a desert and should agree to elect one of their number to baptize, to celebrate Mass, to absolve and to preach,—"this man would as truly be a priest, as if all the Bishops and all the Popes had consecrated him." Against the

* De Wette, *Luther's Briefe,* I., 17.

second he hurls the Article of the Creed: *I believe in a holy Christian Church.* If the Pope were right, then we should have to say: "*I believe in the Pope of Rome,* and reduce the Christian Church to one man, which is a devilish and damnable heresy." The third wall falls as soon as the other two have fallen. The Scriptures do not say that the Pope "has the sole power to call and confirm councils." Since the civil authorities are fellow Christians and fellow priests, they have the right to call councils when there is need. He then proposes twenty-seven articles respecting the reformation of the Christian estate, in which he announces a programme for the complete reorganization of society and the Church.

In the essay on *Christian Liberty* he lays down and defends these two propositions: "A Christian man is the most free lord of all, and is subject to none; a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, and is subject to every one." This paradox contains the essence of all that is taught on the subject of justification by faith and of all that is taught on the subject of love. For all is done by faith, "which makes us not only kings and the freest of all, but also priests forever, a dignity far higher than kingship, because by that priesthood we are worthy to appear before God, to pray for others and to teach each other mutually the things which are of God."

In *A Prelude on the Babylonish Captivity of the Church,* Luther seeks to shatter the entire sacramental system of the Roman Catholic Church. Transubstantiation "must be held as a figment of human opinion, for it rests on no support of Scripture or reason." "The sacrament of the Altar is the testament of Christ, which he left behind him at his death, distributing an inheritance to those who believe in him. Baptism also is a promise, and its profit depends on faith, for unless this faith exists and is applied, baptism profits nothing." The other so-called sacraments, as they exist and are practiced in the Roman Catholic Church, are rejected. "If we speak with perfect accuracy, there are only two sacraments in the Church of God, Baptism and the Bread." It is denied that the Mass is a sacrifice, and it is affirmed that Baptism does not justify, but faith in the promise to which Baptism is added. In a word, the treatise is directed essentially against the *opus operatum,* or the doctrine that a sacrament is salutary simply because it has been administered.

These three treatises, produced in quick succession, have been

very appropriately called *The First Principles of the Reformation,** for they entered fundamentally and vitally into the entire subsequent movement, guided its course and secured its triumph. At Worms Luther was called on to renounce these principles. When he refused to do so he at once translated them into vivid reality and action, and made them the programme for himself and his followers. They involved the translation of the Bible, which was begun the next year on the Wartburg; the purification of worship which was heralded by *The Order of Worship in the Congregation,* 1523, in which the author sounds the keynote: "Where God's Word is not preached, it were better neither to sing, nor to read, nor to assemble"; and by *The Formula Missae,* 1523, which abolished the Canon of the Mass and introduced the communion under both kinds; and by the German Mass, 1525-6, which "was to be arranged on account of the uneducated laity," which, together with the *Formula Missae,* has been followed as a model, and has exerted a normating influence on worship in the entire Lutheran Church.† In the meanwhile (1524) appeared the first German hymn-book, known as the *Achtliederbuch,* because it contained eight hymns, four from the pen of Luther, three from that of Paul Speratus, and one from an unknown author—the small beginning of a rich and powerful development which quickly spread over all Germany and helped to make the Lutheran Church pre-eminently a singing Church.

In the year 1524 the Eucharistic Controversy broke out, which, on the part of Luther, culminated in the so-called *Great Confession of the Lord's Supper,* 1528, in which he proposed three things: (a) To convince his friends that the fanatics have not made answer to his reasoning; (b) to explain the passages that have reference to the sacraments; (c) to acknowledge every article of his faith as an answer to his opponents, both during his lifetime and after his death. In this same year were published the *Visitation Articles,* composed by Melanchthon and edited by Luther and Bugenhagen, as "an evidence and confession of faith," on which the churches in Saxony were reorganized according to the evangelical doctrine and principles

* These essays are accessible in English in a book entitled: *First Principles of the Reformation.* Edited by Drs. Wace and Buchheim. Lutheran Publication Society. Philadelphia, Pa.

†Luther's three formal treatises on worship are given in English in *Christian Worship.* By Richard and Painter. Lutheran Publication Society. Philadelphia, Pa. The originals are given by Richter in *Kirchenordnungen.*

of worship. In the next year Luther sent out the two catechisms as a remedy for the alarming religious ignorance which he had witnessed among the people during the Visitation, and which are still reckoned among the jewels of the Lutheran Church.

Also in the year 1529, perhaps in July or August, Luther "helped to compose" the Articles of Alliance between Saxony, Nürnberg and Franconian Brandenburg. We say "helped to compose," for this is the language by which Luther sets forth his relation to those articles, which are now more commonly known as "the Schwabach Articles"; and we know from an official declaration made at Schmalkald, in December, 1529, that "the articles of faith were very carefully considered, and were composed with the wise counsel of learned and unlearned counsellors," that is, they had been composed by the theologians and the civil counsellors.* Hence there can be no doubt that the hand of Melanchthon was quite as active in composing those articles as was the hand of Luther, for Melanchthon at that time was just as hostile towards the Zwinglians as was Luther (as will be seen a little later), and he generally acted as penman when the theological views held in common by the Wittenberg teachers were to be stated in writing.

October 4th of this same year Luther wrote the so-called Marburg Articles, which are an abbreviated and moderated revision of the so-called "Schwabach Articles."†

And to the writings mentioned in the three last paragraphs must be added Luther's Postils, and scores of sermons, which had been read and pondered by all classes of the German people. The effect of this popular literature, presented in Luther's wonderfully vigorous and popular style, and also of the New Testament, now translated into the most classic German, was little less than a revolution in religious thought and sentiment wherever the German language was known and read, so that a dozen years after the posting of the Ninety-five Theses Luther had millions of followers and adherents among his countrymen, and not a few even beyond the mountains and the seas.

2. *Melanchthon.*

No history of the German Reformation, whether we consider its beginning, its progress, or its conclusion, can be regarded as

* Strobel, *Miscellaneen*, IV., 123. See also von Schubert in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXIX. Band, 3. Heft, 365 and note.

†See the article by von Schubert in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXIX. Band, 3. Heft, *passim*.

complete, which does not contain some account of the life and labors of Philip Melanchthon. In 1518 Frederick the Wise inquired of Reuchlin, called the "phœnix of Germany," for a Professor of Greek in his new university. Reuchlin recommended his nephew, Master Philip Schwartzerd of Bretten, and declared, "He will serve your Electoral Grace with honor and praise. Of this I have no doubt, for I know no one among the Germans who surpasses him, except Erasmus of Rotterdam, who is a Hollander." Melanchthon accepted the Elector's call, and entered Wittenberg, August 25, 1518. Four days later he delivered his inaugural. His subject was: *The Improvement of the studies of Youth* (*De corrigendis adolescentiae studiis*). Everybody was delighted. Luther was in ecstasy, and commended the youthful professor as "worthy of all honor," and as "very learned and highly cultured. His lecture room is filled with students. All the theological students, the highest, the middle, and the lowest classes, study Greek." * Now more than ever before is Wittenberg committed to the new learning, and the new learning is avowedly to be used in the promotion of the new theology. Henceforth the two great men, the hero and the scholar, are as one in aim and in purpose. For twenty-eight years they worked together for the purification of the Church and for the restoration of evangelical simplicity in doctrine and in worship. Each supplemented as well as magnified the work of the other. Hence they are entitled to equal honor for the work of the Reformation. Without Melanchthon the posting of the *Ninety-five Theses* had produced only a monkish squabble, and had ended in a temporary theological diversion. Without Luther the teaching of Greek at Wittenberg had produced only a higher and purer humanistic culture. Their combined labors produced the German Reformation, changed the course of history and hastened the coming of the modern era.

In the Leipzig Disputation, 1519, Melanchthon stood by Luther and quietly assisted him in the debate. Soon he enters into controversy with Eck, and defends Luther's position in a way that brings astonishment to the theological world. A little later he defends Luther against the attack of the Sorbonne, and shows that no council had condemned Luther's doctrine. The Parisian oracle receives such a contradiction as it has never before heard. The Wittenberg contention is now lifted from the ranks of the monks and of the people to the lofty plane of theological science.

* De Wette, I., 134-5.

It is Melanchthon who has introduced the Reformation to the attention of the learned. It is he who gives it dogmatic basis in his *Loci Communes,* 1521, which Luther called an "invincible book and worthy of being placed in the canon." It is he who organizes schools and universities, and writes their text-books. He writes commentaries on Romans, Matthew, Colossians, and in this last he significantly modifies his own earlier and Luther's view of free-will. Melanchthon has become the first theologian of the age. In learning, in culture, and in ability to dispute, he has no equal in the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Thousands of students sit at his feet, and scores go forth annually to proclaim the new gospel from the pulpits in central and northern and western Germany. Compulsory confession has been abolished. The papistical Mass has given place to the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Preaching has been made the central act in the divine worship. Princes and imperial cities have had their churches reorganized on an evangelical basis.

3. *The Diet of Speyer, 1529.*

Not only were the pens of Luther and Melanchthon active during the twenties of the sixteenth century; but none the less those of Eck, Cochlaeus, Fabri and others, in defense of the Pope and of the Roman Catholic Church and its theology. Germany was in a state of theological war. But the Pope and the Emperor were in a relation of political and military antagonism. Hence neither was in position to act effectively against the new heresy. The Diet of Worms did little or nothing to arrest its progress. The decree of the Diet of Speyer (1526) actually promoted its progress, since it left each Prince to do as he saw fit in matters of religion. The Diet of Regensburg, 1527, made no change in the decree of the Diet of Speyer, but resolved that, at the longest, within a year and a half a general council should be called. But as a condition of war between the Pope and the Emperor still existed, a council could not be held.

As the close of the year 1528 brought a change of the entire political situation between the Pope and the Emperor, it was resolved to call a Diet at Speyer for February 2, 1529. This date was afterwards changed to February 21st. The object set forth in the proclamation was to consult in regard to the Turkish invasion and the religious schism in Germany.*

* The Imperial Proclamation and the *Reichstags-Proposition* are given

Ferdinand, King of Bohemia and Hungary, was to represent his brother, the Emperor, at this Diet. He was as much opposed to the Lutheran movement as was his brother, the Emperor. Yet, like Charles, he could not afford to make a complete break with the Evangelical Estates, since he needed both their soldiers and their money against the Turks. But the general situation was such that the Evangelical Estates could hope for very little from this Diet, since they found themselves hopelessly in the minority.

There were present twelve Spiritual Princes besides abbots and many prelates. Of the Catholic Secular Princes thirteen were present, though Prince Erick of Brunswick did not come until April 20th, as likewise also the Bishop of Cleve. Eight Evangelical Princes were present, though the Dukes of Brunswick-Lüneburg came to Speyer first on the twentieth of April.

The Emperor had appointed Ferdinand, three Secular and two Spiritual Princes as special commissioners to represent him in the Diet, which was opened, March 15th, with the reading of the Imperial Proposition by these special commissioners. The Proposition sets forth the danger from the Turks, and asks for help and support against the invaders, and calls attention to the disorders in the matter of religion. Here it was emphasized that since the relations between the Pope and the Emperor had recently changed for the better, a general council would soon be held in order to bring about unity in the faith. But until such council shall be held the Princes, both spiritual and secular, are forbidden by the Emperor, under penalty of ban and re-ban, to allow their subjects to be led to a false faith, or to new sects.

The article on religion in the Decree of 1526 was explained in the most arbitrary way, and was actually declared null and void by the Emperor on his own authority. The Estates were also commanded to take the Emperor's interpretation into the decree of the Diet. This meant the complete abolition of the Decree of 1526.

In a committee of eighteen, appointed to consider the Emperor's Proposition, there were only three Evangelicals, the Elector of Saxony, Jacob Sturm, of Strassburg, and Christopher Tetzel, of Nürnberg. The committee was ready with its report April 2nd. The report was read before the Diet the next day. It recommended compliance with the Proposition, the revocation

by J. J. Müller in *Historie von der Evangelischen Stände-Protestation*, etc., p. 14 *et seqq.*, and in the St. Louis edition of *Luther's Schriften*, XVI., 248 *et seqq.*

of the Decree of 1526, and the enforcement of the Edict of Worms, in such a way that in those territories where the edict had been obeyed there could be no further secession to the evangelical faith; and in those lands in which the new doctrine had found entrance, and from which it could not be expelled without the use of force, all further innovations are rigidly to be avoided until the meeting of the proposed council.*

The Evangelical Estates rejected this proposition and declared that they would abide by the Decree of 1526. Then the majority asked that the report be returned to the committee for modification. But as the modification proposed still annulled the Decree of 1526, the Evangelical members of the committee, the Elector of Saxony, Jacob Sturm and Christopher Tetzel, refused to sign the report of the committee; but they declared themselves ready to submit to an authoritative explanation of the Decree of 1526. The committee was unwilling to make further concessions, and delivered its report to the Estates as the judgment of the committee.

The Diet held session after session, as the Evangelicals still refused to surrender their rights under the Decree of 1526. Finally, April 19th, the report of the majority of the committee was adopted and became a law of the Empire. Against this action of the majority the Evangelicals hastily drew up an answer and laid it before the King, who haughtily rejected it, declaring that he was acting under instructions from the Emperor, and that the case was settled. The Evangelicals then had their protest read in the Diet and incorporated in the minutes, and declared that they would take no further part in the Diet.†

The burden of the protest was that the Decree of 1526 had been abolished prior to the decision of a general council.

The next day, April 20th, the protest, rewritten, expanded in form, but not changed in meaning, expressly named *Protest*, and dated April 20, 1529, was signed by John, Elector of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg in Franconia, Ernest Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg, Philip Landgrave of Hesse, and Wolfgang Prince of Anhalt.‡

Efforts at reconciliation, made by certain Catholic Princes, were unavailing, as the King was inexorable, and as the Protest-

* The Decree and the Protest that followed are given in a Latin text by Coelestin, *Historia*, II., 192 *et seqq.*

† Hauser, *Die Protestation von Speier* (1904), p. 19.

‡ Hauser *ut supra*, p. 20, who gives a *facsimile* of the last page of the Protest and of the names of the five subscribing Princes.

ing Princes adhered to their protest. April 22d, these Protesting Princes were joined by fourteen imperial cities, namely: Strassburg, Nürnberg, Ulm, Constance, Lindau, Memmingen, Kempten, Nördlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Isny, St. Gallen, Weissenburg in Franconia, and Windsheim, which, through their representatives, signed the protest and refused their approbation of the decision of the majority.

On April 24th, the Diet held its last session. The decree, called Recess, was read, and adjournment was pronounced. But the Recess was absolutely silent in regard to the Protest of the Evangelicals. Hence the Protestants had to consider how they could give the necessary legal form to their Protest. In order to do this, the five Protesting Princes and the representatives of the fourteen protesting cities met together Sunday, April 25th, in a private house in the presence of witnesses, and had two imperial public notaries draw up a document (Urkunde) to the effect that the aforesaid princes and cities, in opposition to the decision of the Diet in reference to religion, and especially on account of the annulment of the decree of Speyer of 1526, and on account of enforcement of the Edict of Worms, and also especially against the legality of the Recess of this Diet, make an appeal to the Emperor, and ask for a free Christian council to examine and to decide on the matters in dispute.*

This document, drawn up in legal form by the notaries, constitutes the so-called Appellation to the Emperor. John Eckinger, Alexius Frauentraut and Michael von Kaden were commissioned to carry it and the necessary related documents to Spain, and to present them to the Emperor. But when they reached Genoa they learned that the Emperor had come from Spain to Italy. They then proceeded to Piacenza and obtained an audience on the 12th of September, though they were treated very ungraciously, were distrained of their freedom, and were forbidden to communicate with their principals. October 13th, the Emperor gave his answer to the effect that the Protestants should submit to the Recess of the Diet, and that he had so written them.† Nevertheless, the Protest and Appeal could not be ignored, either by the Emperor or by the Estates.

* Hauser, *ut supra*, pp. 27, 28. The *Instrumentum Appellationis* (the Appeal) is given by J. J. Müller *ut supra*, pp. 51 *et seqq.*, and in St. Louis edition of Luther's *Schriften*, XVI., 286 *et seqq.* Other important documents connected with this Diet are found in the two volumes to which reference has just been made. See also von Ranke, *History of the Reformation*, English translation, pp. 552 *et seqq.*, and the *Realencyclopädie*, vol. 18, pp. 594 *et seqq.*

† For particulars see Sleidan, Bk. VII. *Ad initium.*

There at Speyer five Princes of the Empire and fourteen imperial cities had declared that in imitation of their ancestors they were willing to sacrifice their lives and spend their fortunes in the service of the Emperor, but that in the present case they have to do with matters pertaining to the salvation of their souls; that for years there had been dissensions and quarrels about religion; that no redress of the grievances of the Princes had been made, and no heed had been paid to their demands; that they could not recede from "the doctrine which hitherto they had owned as true and holy without denying the pure and uncorrupted Word of God." That, as to the Popish Mass, it is well known that the ministers of the churches within their dominions had by strong and unanswerable arguments and testimonies of Holy Scripture quite overthrown it, and in its place had appointed the Lord's Supper according to the command and institution of Christ; that they could not permit their people to restore the Mass, which had been abolished; that all men knew what was taught in their churches of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament; that it was right indeed that the Gospel be taught according to the interpretations received by the Church, but the question still was, What is the true Church? that the only sure and infallible way was to stick to the plain and simple teaching of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; that the decree of the former Diet had been made for the sake of peace and concord, but the present decree, should it be enforced, would bring troubles and discontents; and since the case was so, they did not consent to this decree, and would give reasons for their conduct to all men, even to the Emperor himself, and until the meeting of the general provincial council they would not do anything that could not be maintained by law; that after all they were not ignorant of their duty in regard to what had been decreed about living in peace, and about not interfering with the goods of others, about the Anabaptists, about the preachers, about printing and about other matters of importance.*

The Protest and Appeal constitute a great transaction. They are as courteous and respectful as they are bold and courageous. They are the declarations of men who had convictions, and who were willing to sacrifice everything for conscience' sake. Their

* The Protest in condensed form is given in Latin by Sleidan, *De Statu Religionis* (edition of 1557), fol. 98 *et seqq.*, and in Bohun's translation of the same (1689), pp. 119, 120.

content is that the Recess of the Diet is null and void, and that in matters of religion their signers will conduct themselves according to the decree of the previous Diet of Speyer, and as they thought they could give answer to God. Wisely and well has it been said: "The Protest of Speyer was a renewal and expansion of Luther's protest at Worms. The protest of a single monk had become the protest of princes and representatives of leading cities of the Empire, who now for the first time became an organized party. It was the protest of conscience against tyrannical authority." * And von Ranke has said of it: "Thus distinguished princes, chiefly in Northern Germany, thus notable and rich cities, chiefly in Southern and Western Germany, all united in one thought, formed a power which commanded regard. They were resolved to defend themselves by their common forces against every act of violence from the side of the majority." †

Christian Germany was now divided on the subject of religion. On the one side stood tradition and the hierarchy. On the other side stood the open Bible and the freedom of the Christian conscience. Neither side wanted war. Catholics and Protestants alike desired a general council or a national assembly for the settlement of the dispute, and both the Pope and the Emperor had promised a council. So matters stood at the end of April, 1529. The Summer and Autumn was a period of anxiety to the Protestants. Luther and Melanchthon, at the command of the Elector of Saxony, rendered an opinion decidedly adverse to the Recess of the Diet and in support of the Protest. ‡

4. *Efforts at Alliance Among the Protestants.*

The Protesting Princes and cities were not in full doctrinal accord with each other. Philip of Hesse and several of the cities were strongly inclined to some of the views of Zwingli. "In the moment of need the Lutheran Princes had not hesitated to unite with them." § But no sooner had they separated than the old antipathies regained their ascendency, especially in the minds of the Saxon theologians. It was but natural that it should be so. It was in the spirit and in the habit of the times to require perfect agreement in the faith as a pre-condition of either ecclesiastical or political alliance. Hence "it can hardly

* Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. VI., pp. 691, 692.

† *Deutsche Geschichte.* Seibente Auflage, 3, p. 115.

‡ J. J. Müller, *ut supra*, pp. 47 *et seqq.* Walch, XVI., 358-361. St. Louis edition of *Luther's Schriften*, XVI., 283 *et seqq.*

§ Von Ranke, *History of the Reformation.* English translation, p. 552.

be affirmed that these theological scruples ought to have been utterly disregarded, or that Luther was to be blamed for entertaining them.

"We must consider that the whole reformation originated in religious convictions, which admit of no compromise, no condition, no extenuation. The spirit of an exclusive orthodoxy, expressed in rigid formulæ, and denying salvation to its antagonists, now ruled the world. Hence the violent hostility between the two confessions, which in some respects approximated so nearly." *

At the Diet of Speyer the Catholic majority had forbidden "the doctrine opposed to the venerable sacrament of the true body and blood of Christ." This action was aimed at the cities of Upper Germany, and was intended both to arrest the Zwinglian influence in Germany, and to win over the Lutherans.† Nevertheless, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse concluded "a particular secret alliance" with Nürnberg, Ulm and Strassburg, the object of which was to defend themselves only if they were attacked on account of their faith, or obstructed in the visitation of the churches, under pretext of spiritual jurisdiction, from whatever source the attack might come.‡

Delegates were to meet in June at Rotach in the Franconian mountains to consider the terms of agreement and the ways in which they should assist each other.

But after the Diet it was discovered that the agreement contemplated also a political alliance. This might easily be construed as intended to operate against the Emperor. Any procedure of this kind was contrary to the fundamental principles of the Lutheran theologians, who had always maintained that the faith should be defended, not by the sword, but by the Word of God. Hence an alliance such as had been contemplated had to be abandoned. The Lutherans could consent to no alliance not based on absolute agreement in the faith. The Luther-Zwingli controversy over the Lord's Supper was fresh in the memories of the Wittenbergers; and the cities of Ulm and Strassburg had taken sides with Zwingli. Melanchthon, who believed that larger concessions would have been made by the Catholics had the Lutherans separated themselves from the Zwinglians, reproached himself for his silence on this subject, and returned home in

* Von Ranke, *ut supra,* p. 565.
† *Würtembergische Kirchengeschichte,* p. 301.
‡ Von Ranke, *ut supra,* p. 563. Kolde, *Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte* (1896), p. 96.

great distress of mind. He wrote to one friend and to another about it, declaring that his "conscience was disquieted"; that the matter had caused him "to neglect all the duties of friendship and all his studies"; that he would "rather die than to endure it longer"; that "the godless opinions of Zwingli must on no account be defended." *

On returning to Wittenberg, Melanchthon made his scruples known to Luther, whereupon the latter on his own motion wrote the Elector, May 22nd, and warned him against the Landgrave, "because he is a turbulent man," and against forming an alliance with him and with the cities of Upper Germany, declaring that the proposed alliance is not of God, nor proceeds from confidence in God, but from human conceit; that it seeks and trusts to human help alone; that there is no reason for it; that it can bring no good results; that the Papists are not so strong nor have so much courage as to be able to accomplish anything; that to form an alliance with the enemies of God and the sacrament is to become partakers of their sins. The cities by their "heresy in regard to the sacrament sin in all." "He is not less an infidel who denies one article than Arius or any other." "We know and hold that they are wrong, and we cannot recognize their error or place it in doubt, therefore we cannot with a good conscience have anything to do with them." "They are audacious enemies of God and his Word." †

This letter, and the more formal opinion that followed it, very much disturbed the Elector, for he himself, in connection with the Landgrave, had invited the Zwinglian cities to an alliance, had named the day for further conference, and had promised to send delegates to Rotach. In this quandary he sent Hans von Minkwitz, his chancellor, to Rotach, but instructed him to consult the Nürnbergers, to consider the question of conscience, and to agree to nothing final, but only to a scheme for an alliance, which should become operative only when anyone is attacked "on acount of the faith and on account of the things which are dependent upon and follow from the articles which are to be treated in a future council." ‡ Thus purely defensive. There was no agreement on the Articles of Faith. It was found that the Nürnberg preachers entertained the same scruples that had arisen in the minds of the Wittenbergers, and that they

* C. R. I., 1069, 1075, 1076. Von Ranke, *ut supra*, p. 564.

† De Wette, III., 454 and 465.

‡ The Instruction to Minkwitz is given by von Schubert in *Zeitschrift f. Kirchg.*, XXIX., 3, p. 382.

had warned the council to have nothing to do with the "Sacramenters." The same sentiment was entertained by the Margravians.

Hence the Recess of the convention, called *Confederations-Notel,* is very general in its character. It begins by proclaiming absolute loyalty to the Emperor and to the Empire, rehearses the essence of the Speyer Protest, and speaks about "the Divine Word," " the Holy Gospel, our faith and religion "; but it does not say what any of these are, or how they are to be understood. It then declares that should any one of the parties to the alliance be attacked on account of his religion, the others will assist him * —substantially a repetition of the instruction given to Minkwitz. It has none of the elements of a confession of faith.

But it was known, and had been again and again declared by representatives of the German and of the Swiss Reformation, that dissensions existed in regard to the faith. This was an inauspicious condition in view of the hostile attitude of the Catholic princes, and of the Emperor, who expected soon to be freed from embarrassing relations with France and with the Pope. Alliance for defense on the part of the Protestants was but a dictate of ordinary prudence in the line of self-protection; and efforts at alliance there were:

1. Philip of Hesse, who was strongly drawn towards Zwinglianism, and who had been disappointed by the issue of the Rotach conference, regarded the differences between the two great leaders as neither fundamental nor irreconcilable. He believed that the common interests of the Protestants were in peril, and that an alliance between the Protestants of Germany and of Switzerland was necessary for mutual protection. Accordingly he resolved to bring the chief disputants to a friendly conference at his own castle, " though it should cost him six thousand gulden." Luther and a few of his adherents, and Zwingli and a few of his adherents, were invited to meet at Marburg.† Luther accepted the invitation reluctantly. Zwingli accepted it with alacrity. October 1-3, 1529, they discussed their differences—the first day Luther with Oecolampadius, and Melanchthon with Zwingli—for the most part in a dignified and friendly manner. The Lutherans did not find the Zwinglians so heretical as they had imagined them

* The *Confederations-Notel,* which was signed by the representatives of Saxony, Brandenburg, Hesse, Strassburg, Nürnberg and Ulm, is found in J. J. Müller's *Historie,* pp. 236 *et seqq.* See Kolde, *ut supra,* p. 97.

† The invitation went to Wittenberg, July 1st. Kolde, *ut surpa,* p. 100.

to be. Nor did the Zwinglians find the Lutherans so obstinate as they had expected to find them. Both parties showed a reasonably conciliatory spirit. An agreement was reached on the doctrine of original sin, of the person and work of Christ, on the righteousness of faith, on the efficacy of the external Word, on Baptism as more than a symbol, and even on the article of the Lord's Supper, in that both parties believe and hold that bread and wine should be used; that the Mass should be rejected, and that "it was given and ordained, in order that weak consciences might be excited by the Holy Ghost to faith and love." But they did not agree "as to whether the true body and blood of Christ are bodily present in the bread and wine."

These points and numerous others were embodied in fifteen articles by Luther on October 4th, and were signed by Luther, Melanchthon, Jonas, Osiander, Brentz, Agricola, Oecolampadius, Zwingli, Bucer and Hedio. They are known as the Marburg Articles, and will ever stand as a monument to the magnanimity of both parties. According to the latest and best conclusions of historical science they are based on articles which Luther had "helped to compose" for an entirely different purpose.* But they were not composed and signed as the basis either of a political or of a religious alliance between the two parties. Hence this colloquy failed to accomplish the object for which it was called, though the colloquists parted with the best of feeling towards each other, and Luther, both on the way home and afterwards, expressed himself again and again as hopeful of pacific results.

2. There is very strong reason to believe that very soon, perhaps immediately, after the Rotach conference, the Saxons, the Margravians and perhaps the Nürnbergers, began to move in the direction of the formation of a politico-religious alliance based on the confession of the strictly Lutheran teaching, in other words, on articles of faith as the same had been taught and were held at Wittenberg.† A meeting of representatives of Saxony, Brandenburg and Hesse was held at Saalfeld, July 8th. But nothing was accomplished, since Saxony and Brandenburg would not unite with Strassburg because of the views held by that city on the sacrament. Brandenburg expressed itself on this subject as positively as Saxony had done, and things seem to have been arranged for excluding rather than for including

* *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1908), XXIX., 3, 342 *et seqq.*
† Kolde, *ut supra*, pp. 98, 99.

Strassburg and other Upper German cities, though Nürnberg was to be included in the proposed alliance.

From Saalfeld the Saxon court went to Wittenberg. Here, it is believed, about the middle of July, orders were given for articles of faith such as were required by Saxony and Brandenburg as the necessary pre-condition of the proposed politico-religious alliance: "From the middle of July to the middle of September the work was done, attended by official communication with Brandenberg. At the middle of September a definite decision was made in regard to the form of the articles as a presupposition for the alliance of the Princes, to be concluded at Schleiz on the basis of these articles." *

Such, it is believed, as the result of the most exhaustive historical and critical inquiry, is the course of the preparation of the so-called Schwabach Articles, which Luther "helped to compose,"—not at Marburg, October 5th (Riederer, Heppe), and not at Schleiz, as some have thought, but at Wittenberg, and which, therefore, preceded the Marburg Articles. These articles, seventeen in number, thus composed, were carried to Schwabach *via* Nürnberg, where the representatives of Saxony, Brandenburg and Nürnberg held a council on the evening of October 15th. By the evening of the sixteenth all the delegates found themselves at Schwabach except the Hessian, who came the next day. Monday, October 18th, the transactions were begun and finished.† Strassburg and Ulm declined to accept the Seventeen Articles, giving as the reason for their action, that articles of faith had not been proposed by the Rotach Conference; that these articles were not in harmony with the doctrines preached in their churches, and that they had received no commission from their constituents to sign articles of faith.‡ On Tuesday, 19th, all the delegates signed the Recess, in which, among other things, it was resolved to meet, December 15th, at Schmalkald, for the

* Von Schubert in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* XXIX. Band, 3. Heft, p. 377. In this connection see also Kolde, *ut supra, passim.* J. J. Müller, *Historie,* pp. 280 *et seqq.*

† *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, ut supra,* p. 356. For slight differences in dates, Kolde, *ut supra,* p. 110, and *Realencyclopädie,* 3. 18, p. 2.

‡ Müller, *Historie,* p. 303. Von Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte,* 3. 127 Weber, *Kritische Geschichte, A. C.,* I., *Erste Beilage.* Von Schubert, in the article from which we have quoted, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* XXIX. Band, 3. Heft (Aug., 1908), in thus placing the composition of the so-called Schwabach Articles before the composition of the so-called Marburg Articles, regards the latter as an abbreviated edition of the former. His argument is sustained by such an array of facts, and by such strong psychological and critical reasons, that it has commanded the consent of competent historical scholars. The author may not have spoken the last word on the subject, but

purpose of reaching a consensus in regard to the controverted articles, and, if possible, to conclude the proposed alliance.*

Meanwhile, since Rotach, dangers had thickened. The Emperor and the Pope had buried their contentions in the Peace of Barcelona. It could now be easily foreseen that the temporal and the spiritual head of Christendom would unite for the suppression of the Protestants. Moreover, the commissioners who carried the Protest across the Alps had now returned, bringing the most dismal reports about the hostility of the Emperor. The affairs of the Evangelicals never looked so dark, and the need of a Protestant alliance never seemed so imperative. The Landgrave had become more insistent than ever for an alliance. As a consequence of this, and of the perilous situation, the Schmalkald Convention was far more numerously attended than either of its predecessors had been. Besides princes and counts, nine of the protesting cities were represented. The conclusion of the whole matter is thus presented by von Ranke: "The seventeen articles were once more laid before the Oberlanders (who were here far more numerous than at Schwabach). Ulm and Strassburg, whose example was usually followed by the others, definitely declared that they would not sign them. The Lutherans, in an equally decided manner, declared that, in that case, they could not enter into an alliance with them. Their own earnest entreaties, and the zeal with which the Landgrave exerted himself in their behalf—urging that there was nothing to be expected from the Emperor but disfavor and violence—were equally vain. The other party refused even to communicate to them the report of the delegates, unless they would first declare their assent to the profession of faith." †

Thus the several efforts made to effect a Protestant alliance have failed. The year 1529, the most momentous in the history of the Reformation up to that time, closed with a dark and ominous horizon. Even at Nürnberg, in the following January, the Lutherans failed to agree on the proposition of a defensive alliance. In the very face of approaching danger they stood

his conclusions certainly do supersede all older theories of the chronological and theological relations of these two series of articles. The Schwabach Articles are utterly incompatible with the frame of mind which both Luther and Melanchthon brought with them from Marburg, unless we are willing to conclude that both were double-faced.

* The Recess in Weber, *ut supra*, I., First *Beilage*.

† *History of the Reformation*, English translation, p. 571. See also Strobel, *Miscellaneen*, IV., 112 *et seqq.*, who gives the Protocol of this Convention. And Möller-Kawerau, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3 ed., III., 93, which gives as the date of this transaction, Nov. 29, 1529.

still and took counsel only of God and of their own consciences. "Unquestionably, this was not prudent, but it was great," says von Ranke.

But in the last nine years Lutheranism has spread amazingly in central, western and northern Germany, and even beyond. In Electoral Saxony, in Franconian Brandenburg and in Hesse, it had become organized, and the University of Marburg had been established. The cities of Brunswick and Hamburg received each an evangelical Church order, respectively in 1528 and 1529. Schleswig-Holstein became essentially Lutheran in 1526. Prussia was Lutheran since 1525. Magdeburg had been reformed by Nicholas von Amsdorf in 1524, and all the churches of Bremen, except the cathedral, were in the hands of the Lutherans in 1525. In other countries also the Reformation had made important advances, as in Sweden, where it was introduced by Gustavus Vasa at the Diet of Westeräs in 1527, and in Denmark in 1527, where it was accorded equal rights with the old Church. The cities of Stralsund, Hall, Lüneburg and Liegnitz had received the Reformation respectively in 1525, 1526, 1527, 1527. In other words, Lutheranism now numbers its friends and adherents by the millions. These millions of Lutherans are allied chiefly by a common opposition to the Papacy, to episcopal jurisdiction, to a system of corrupt doctrines, to an immoral clergy, and by the determination to preach and to teach the Gospel according to the conception of it that emanated from Wittenberg. But they did not have in common an authoritative declaration of the Lutheran teaching. This was now their greatest need. With this need staring them in the face, they started for Augsburg in April, 1530. Rotach, and Marburg, and Schwabach, and Schmalkald, had been prophetic in so far as they had expressed a sense of need.*

* Important information on the Rotach Conference and on the Schwabach and Schmalkald Conventions is given in the Strassburg *Politische Correspondenz,* pp. 269 *et seqq.,* 400 *et seqq.* and 418 *et seqq.*

CHAPTER II.

THE DIET AT AUGSBURG IN THE YEAR 1530.

On the 29th of June, 1529, Charles V. concluded "an indissoluble peace, friendship and alliance" with the Pope at Barcelona. On the 5th of August following he effected a reconciliation with Francis I. of France.* Seven days later he landed at Genoa. February 22 and 24, 1530, he was crowned at Bologna, first with the iron crown of Lombardy, and then with the imperial crown.† But the situation in the Empire was by no means inspiring. The Turks had besieged Vienna, and were desolating the fairest portions of Austria. Some of the Emperor's most powerful and loyal German Princes, and fourteen imperial cities had protested against the action of the majority at Speyer, and with their Protest had sent an Appeal across the Alps to the Emperor, to a national council and to impartial judges. Even a ruler less astute and less diplomatic than Charles would have seen the necessity of calling a diet and of instituting pacific measures for removing grievances and for averting dangers. Charles was equal to the occasion. Accordingly, January 21, 1530, he issued from Bologna an imperial Rescript, summoning a diet to meet at Augsburg, April 8th ensuing. The object of the Diet, as set forth in the Rescript, was to counsel about resistance to the Turks, and to consider the best methods of allaying the dissensions about religion. The references to the religious dissensions are couched in language at once mild and conciliatory: "To consult and to decide in regard to the disturbances and dissensions of the Holy Faith and the Christian Religion. And in order that all dissensions and errors may be abolished in a salutary manner, all sentiments and opinions are to be heard, understood and considered between us in love and kindness, and are to be composed in sincerity, so as to put away what is not right in both parties, that true religion may be accepted and held by us all, that as we

* The treaty was signed, August 3d, and ratified by oath, August 5th. Baumgarten, *Geschichte Karls V.* II., 698-703.

† Baumgarten, II., 704.

live and serve under one Christ, so we may live in one fellowship, Church and unity." *

The Imperial Rescript, couched in such mild and gracious language, at once dispelled the darkness from the minds of the Protestants and awakened hope in their hearts. It recognized them as a "party," and gave full assurance that an amicable settlement of existing differences was to be expected. They were now to have a hearing before their peers in a diet presided over by an impartial judge, for in their intense loyalty to the Emperor they believed that he would judge their cause with fairness and impartiality. Accordingly, when the Rescript reached Torgau, March 11th, it was at once decided that the Elector of Saxony should attend the Diet in person, and it was resolved, at the suggestion of the electoral counsellors, that the following named persons should accompany him as "learned counsellors"; "Dr. Martin, Jonas the Provost, Philip Melanchthon, Musa of Jena. Dr. Martin and Jonas are to remain at Nürnberg and await further orders. Master Eisleben as preacher; Master Spalatin to be employed in connection with faith, and for other reasons, together with other scholars." †

1. *The Preparation for the Diet.*

Not only did the counsellors provide that the Elector should be attended by his theologians, who, in their own persons, might advise in regard to the doctrine that had been preached in his dominions, but the wise senior chancellor, Dr. Gregory Brück, forecasting the importance of the proposed Diet, addressed the following to the Elector in a letter: "Inasmuch as the Imperial Rescript provides that the opinion and view of each one is to be heard, it would be a good thing for us to bring together systematically, in writing, the views maintained by our party, and to fortify them out of Holy Writ, so as to present them in writ-

* The original is given by Förstemann in *Urkundenbuch zu der Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg*, I., 2-9. "According to other testimonies, a formal league was concluded, at Bologna, of the following import: The Emperor and Ferdinand were to make every effort to bring back the heretics, and the Pope was to supply the spiritual means. But if they stubbornly persisted, the Emperor and Ferdinand were to coerce them by arms and the Pope was to see that the other Christian princes assisted with all their forces." Again: "The Emperor was exhorted to unite with the Catholic estates, to work against the Protestants, at first with promises and threats, and then by violence, and after their suppression to establish an inquisition." Gieseler, *Church History*, IV., pp. 136-7, notes. To the same effect see von Ranke, 3., p. 163. See Baumgarten, *Geschichte Karls V.*, vol. III., 24, note. Brieger, *Geschichte A. C.*, p. 46.

† Förstemann, I., 13 *et seqq.*

ing, in case the preachers should not be admitted to participation in the transactions. This will facilitate business, and it will serve to remove misunderstanding to have such views and opinions presented." *

In all probability it was this prudent suggestion that induced the Elector, March 14th, to write a somewhat lengthy letter to the Wittenberg theologians, in which he informs them that a diet is to be held at Augsburg, beginning April 8th, ensuing; that such diet will probably take the place of a national council that matters pertaining to religion are to be considered; that whatever is not right in both parties is to be corrected, so that "all may receive and hold one true religion, and as we all live and serve under one Christ, so we may live in one fellowship, Church and unity, and finally thus attain to a good unity and peace." He then instructs the theologians to prepare "Articles both of faith and other church usages and ceremonies," and to present them in person at Torgau by Sunday, the 20th; and further: "If the preachers and estates shall not be permitted to attend, ye, and especially you, Doctor *Martin,* shall await our further decision at Coburg." †

It must be remembered that the Imperial Rescript had declared the restoration of Christian fellowship and unity to be the *religious* aim of the proposed Diet. The report of the Saxon counsellors to the Elector, Dr. Brück's letter to the Elector, and the Elector's letter to his theologians, prove to a demonstration that the Saxon court at Torgau was fully possessed by the thought, desire and purpose of reconciliation with the Church, and that they all enter upon the preparation for the Diet with such thought, desire and purpose in the ascendant. This is made so clear by these and other official documents, and is expressed with such evident sincerity and simplicity, that it becomes *a chief point of view from which to study the history of the Augsburg Confession,* and *it furnishes the necessary cue for ascertaining the intended meaning of the Confession;* and *it explains the conduct and the concessions of the entire electoral party in the negotiations subsequently made at Augsburg for the complete restoration of concord and unity.* Hence, nothing can be further from the truth than the representation that the Saxon court went to Augsburg with a belligerent, defiant, aggressive spirit. They went in the spirit of humility and obed-

* Förstemann, I., 39.
† Förstemann, I., 41-44.

ience. They took the Emperor at his word, and sought to effect peace and reconciliation. Even the Wittenberg theologians and other theologians partook of the same frame of mind, as is evident from their letters. Luther wrote to Jonas as follows: "The Prince writes us, that is, you, Pomeranus, Philip and me, a letter in common, to unite, and, putting aside everything else, to make ready by next Sunday whatever is necessary for the Diet on the coming eighth of April. For the Emperor Charles himself will be at Augsburg, and will amicably settle (amice compositurus) all things, as he writes in his proclamation. Hence to-day and to-morrow, though you are absent, we three will do what we can. Nevertheless, it will be your duty also to obey the Prince, and, turning over your duties to your colleagues, to join us here to-morrow. For all is hurry. Christ grant that everything may be done to his glory. Amen. 12 o'clock, March 14, Anno 1530."* On the day following Melanchthon wrote to Jonas in a similar strain of delight and gratification: "A Diet has been appointed at Augsburg. The Emperor has graciously promised to review the case and to correct the faults of both parties."†

But this exhilaration on the part of the Protestants need not affect us with surprise. Notwithstanding all that had occurred, they still maintained that they stood in the unity of the Church. When the Emperor had announced his intention of granting a Diet, and of composing the controversies about religion, no one could feel like declining the gracious proposal. Everyone must feel like meeting him half way and trying to gain the most favorable decision for Protestantism. Yet the nature of the preparations made by the Wittenberg theologians is not definitely known. We know that they did not appear in Torgau on Sunday, March 20th, for March 21st the Elector addressed them another letter, and urged them to come to Torgau and to bring their books with them, as some things awaited their attention.‡ Melanchthon was in Torgau March 27th, but Luther did not go.§

Whether Melanchthon took books and "articles of faith and

* De Wette, *Luther's Briefe*, III., 564.

† *Corpus Reformatorum*, II., 28. See the Preface to the Augsburg Confession; Melanchthon's letters to Camerarius, C. R. II., 119, and p. 280; Deus fortunet concilia pacis; and Brentz's letter to Isenmann, June 24, 1530: "In ea (Confessione) petunt principes, ut amice controversia componatur, et pax constituatur." C. R. II., 125; Virch in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1888), pp. 68-71: "With evident approximation to the Catholic Standpoint."

‡ C. R. II., 33.

§ Köstlin, *Martin Luther* (1883), II., 651; Plitt, *Einleitung*, I., 520, n. 2.

ceremonies'' with him to Torgau is not a matter of contemporaneous record. The ripest scholarship can only say with Professor Kolde: ''A document with the title 'Torgau Articles,' or which on the basis of contemporaneous reports can with certainty be shown to have been delivered at that time, we do not possess. Hence the most diverse conjectures have been promulgated. Yet the researches of Engelhardt (*Zh.-Th.*, 1865, 515, ff.) and especially of Brieger (*Kirchengeschichtliche Studien*, 1888, p. 268, ff.), have rendered it highly probable that the much sought 'Torgau Articles' are identical with an opinion (Gutachten) (Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 68-84), which, as an important document, was taken to Augsburg by the Elector, and manifestly became the foundation subsequently of the Augsburg Confession. And this is not contradicted by the fact that the writing in question, contrary to the Elector's order to report 'on faith and ceremonies,' treats only of the latter. For the authors remember that according to the admission of their opponents, even the doctrine preached in the Elector's dominions, 'is Christian and comforting, and right in itself, and that the schism had arisen chiefly on account of certain abuses,' which had been introduced by the doctrines and statutes of men, and because they could not concede that their doctrine is new, or that it differs from the genuine, true, evangelical doctrine of the Church, they, according to their own declaration, limited themselves to the reasons for the abolition of those abuses. They also promised, in case there was a desire to know what else was preached in the Electorate, 'to present articles in which the entire teaching was embraced in an orderly way' in general, also, a further elaboration of the original *Gutachten*, which had been hastily composed and was intended to be presented to the Diet by the Elector alone, was kept in view from the beginning, and was already resolved upon.'' *

Indeed, if we accept the essay A, given in Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 68-84, and in Jacob's *Book of Concord*, II., 75-86, as ''the Torgau Articles,'' or as a part of the same, then it becomes at once obviously certain that doctrinal articles were not presented to the Elector at Torgau in answer to his requisition, for it is impossible to conceive that the Wittenberg theologians would say in that essay: ''The things thus far stated have reference to external ordinances and customs,'' and promise ''to give articles on the entire Christian doctrine in answer to

* Article, *Augsburger Bekenntnis* in *Real-Encyclopädie*, II., 243. See Kolde, *Augsburgische Konfession*, p. 2.

a desire, should it be made.'' and then, at the same time, *present* articles on doctrine. Yet the question cannot be decided absolutely,* though the fact, now universally recognized, that the Augsburg Confession, in its original form—Apology it was at first called—did not contain articles of faith,† makes it as good as certain that articles of faith were not sent to Torgau by the Wittenberg theologians as a part of their response to the Elector's requisition. And as for the statement made by some of the older historians of the Augsburg Confession,‡ viz., that ''before the journey to Augsburg began, Luther composed seventeen articles,'' which are ''the archetype of the Augsburg Confession,''—such statement, both as regards the chronology and the purpose of the Schwabach Articles, is purely gratuitous, since we know that the seventeen Schwabach Articles, which are ''the archetype'' of the first *seventeen* articles of the Augsburg Confession, were neither composed nor even *revised* in view of the proposed Diet, as we learn from Luther's own words in the Preface to his published edition of those Articles. He says: ''Seventeen articles have lately been published under my name with a title that indicates that I meant to lay the same before the present Diet. Of such a thing I never had a thought. It is true that I helped to compose such articles, for they were not composed by me alone, but not on account of the Papists, nor to lay before this Diet. It is very well known why they were composed. I had not even intended that they should be published, much less that they should go out with such a title under my name. And he who did it knows very well that I had neither commanded nor wished it. Not that I shun the light, or think that such articles are not right. They are too good and too precious to be used in negotiations with the Papists. For what do they care about such beautiful, holy, superb articles?'' §

This Preface is decisive against the supposition that the Schwa-

* See Brieger, *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* p. 311.

† *Die Aelteste Redaktion der Augsb. Konf.* Kolde.

‡ Coelestin, pp. 25 *et seqq.* J. J. Müller, p. 441. Chytræus, *Historia,* p. 18.

§ Erlangen edition of *Luther's Works,* vol. XXIV., 337. These seventeen articles, known as the Schwabach Articles, were published early in the year 1530 by Hans Bern, of Coburg, with the title: ''The Confession of Martin Luther composed in Seventeen Articles to be laid before the present Diet at Augsburg.'' Misled by the title, Conrad Wimpina, John Mensing, Wolfgang Roderfer and Rupert Elgersma, Catholic theologians at Augsburg, wrote a refutation of the articles. Thereupon Luther, who was residing in the castle at Coburg, wrote a Preface (from which we have just quoted) to these seventeen articles and had the whole printed at Wittenberg under the title: ''Martin Luther's Reply to the Howl of Certain Papists.'' These articles, as published by Luther, reached Augsburg in May, as we learn from a letter written by Jacob Sturm to Zwingli. *Zwinglis Werke,* VIII., 459.

bach Articles were sent to Torgau as a part of the preparations for the Diet. It was subsequent exigencies, as will be shown hereafter, which called the seventeen Schwabach Articles into requisition, first, as *the Elector of Saxony's Confession of Faith*, and secondly, as the *basis* of the first seventeen articles of the Augsburg Confession.

2. *Torgau Articles.*

But it is now the conclusion of scholars and specialists in this field of Reformation history that, between March 14th and 27th, certain articles on abuses, now called "Torgau Articles," were composed by Melanchthon,* and were subsequently, possibly not before April 3d, taken to Torgau, and for that reason called "Torgau Articles." But of contemporaneous documentary proof of this conclusion, and of the veritable existence of "Torgau Articles," there is not a line known to historians. That is, there does not exist a line, or even a word from the times, which tells us that the Wittenberg theologians wrote articles on "external ceremonies," March 14th to 27th, and sent or carried them to Torgau; nor have we any document from the times inscribed *Torgau Articles.* It is only highly probable, not historically and demonstratively certain, that the essay consisting of several parts, and discussing several subjects, discovered by Karl Edward Förstemann at Weimar,† and published by him in his *Urkun-*

* See Engelhardt in Niedner's *Zeitschrift,* 1865, pp. 515-629, and especially Brieger's learned and exceedingly acute essay in *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* 1888, pp. 268-320. Also *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1897, pp. 301 *et seqq.* For the Refutation of the Papists, and Luther's Reply, see St. Louis edition of *Luther's Schriften,* vol. XVI., 638 *et seqq.*

† At the same time and place Förstemann discovered other essays, which he published in the *Urkundenbuch,* all arranged in the order of the alphabet from A to F. But the order in which these essays exist in the copy, that is, not in the hand of their author or authors, is D A B E F C. Förstemann introduced the entire list with the title: Der nach *Torgau* berufenen Wittenberger Gelehrten Bedenken über die streitigen Artikel. Jacobs has given these articles in English in the same order, and has subtitled them: THE TORGAU ARTICLES. *Book of Concord,* II., pp. 75-98. But neither Förstemann nor Jacobs seems to have examined these articles critically. Indeed, the latter seems to have followed the former implicitly in accepting these articles taken altogether as the Torgau Articles and has named them *The Foundation of the Articles on Abuses.* He has also accepted the theory, as Krauth had already done (*Conservative Reformation,* p. 223), propounded by Förstemann, that the Preface (exordium) spoken of by Melanchthon in his letter to Luther, May 4th (C. R. II., 39), is the whole first or doctrinal part of the Confession. But long ago Bretschneider (C. R. IV., 999 *et seqq.*) and Plitt (*Einleitung in die Augustana,* I., 523) gave ample reasons for the rejection of this theory about the Preface. And now comes *Die aelteste Redaktion der Augsburger Konfession,* which explodes the theory forever, for it contains the "long and rhetorical preface" spoken of by Melanchthon.‡

‡ See *The Lutheran Quarterly,* January, 1907, pp. 44 *et seqq.*

denbuch zu der Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530, pp. 68-84, was written by Melanchthon at Wittenberg, March 14th to 27th, carried to Torgau, and thence to Augsburg, and used finally in composing the second part of the Augsburg Confession. The data now known to exist will not allow more definite affirmations in regard to a basis of the Articles on Abuses. Hence no competent scholar would affirm so confidently of these essays as Förstemann did: "That incontestably they were written upon order of the Elector by the Wittenberg theologians, and that they are to be considered as without doubt the foundation of the second part of the Augsburg Confession." Criticism, conducted with ample learning and with great acuteness by Bretschneider, Plitt, Engelhardt, Knaake, Brieger, Kolde,* has reached the conclusion that all the essays in question must be excluded from consideration except A, and Brieger has summed up the result of the discussions in these words: "As a result of our comparison we may set it down that A *in fact served as preparatory work for the Augustana.* The manner in which it is employed in Article 25, and in individual expressions of 23 and 24 and elsewhere, leave no doubt in regard to a perfectly demonstrable relationship, so that even those articles in which we are not led necessarily to employ A, this essay has, as a matter of fact, furnished the basis for the further elaboration." † Bretschneider, Plitt, Virch and Kolde agree with this conclusion, though the three first named think that the essay was written at Coburg, and Kolde has taken it into his *Augsburg Confession* as an appendix under the title: *The Torgau Articles.*‡ But the Essay A, whether it arose at Wittenberg or at Coburg, makes it perfectly clear that it was not the intention of the writer to exhibit doctrinal articles before the Diet. It contains not a single article of doctrine. It promises a "long and rhetorical preface," and then discusses *The Doctrines and Ordinances of Men, The Marriage of Priests, Both Forms, The Mass, Confession, The Worship of Saints, German Singing.* The introduction is apologetic in character. Its aim is to vindicate "his Electoral Grace" against the charge of "dispensing with all divine service, and of introducing a heathenish, dissolute mode

* See C. R. IV., 973-4; Plitt's *Einleitung,* I., 320; Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865), pp. 550 *et seqq.;* Knaake's *Luther's Antheil; Kirchenq. Studien,* pp. 268 *et seqq. Real Encyc.,* II., 243; *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1897, pp. 303 *et seqq.*

† *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* p. 305.

‡ *Die Augsburgische Konfession,* pp. 2 and 128 *et seqq.*

of life and insubordination, from which the destruction of all Christendom results.'' It declares that his Electoral Grace has always been inclined to peace and has helped to maintain peace. It then says: ''To this effect it is well to place first a long and rhetorical preface.'' It says further that ''his Electoral Grace'' is making provision for the preaching of the Gospel, and that ''every one, even among the adversaries, must acknowledge that this doctrine, which is taught and treated, is Christian and comforting''; and finally: ''The dissension is now especially concerning abuses, which have been introduced by human teaching and statutes, of which we will report in order, and will indicate for what reason my lord is induced to cause certain abuses to be abated.''

And if we analyze the introduction to these articles we find:

1. It uses throughout the first person singular, as ''my lord,'' not *our* lord, when speaking of the Elector. This shows that the essay is the production of one man, not the joint composition of several.

2. It calls the adversaries themselves to witness to the purity of the doctrine taught in the Electoral dominions.

3. It declares that the dissension has arisen principally on account of abuses.

4. It shows that the essay was written for the Elector alone, and consequently that it is Saxon in origin, and was intended to vindicate the *Elector* before the Diet.

And now when we turn to the Articles, we find that not one of them discusses a *doctrine*. They all treat of ''human ordinances which cannot be observed without sin.'' The titles borne by these articles are in some instances identical, and in others nearly identical, with the titles given to the Articles on Abuses in Melanchthon's *editio principes*, Latin and German, of the Augsburg Confession, which fact forms a powerful argument in favor of the supposition that this essay was used in composing the second part of the Confession, and has its parallel in the fact that the doctrinal articles are simply *numbered* just as is the case in the Schwabach Articles, which form the basis, in the main, of those doctrinal articles. The coincidence cannot be regarded as accidental in either case.*

We may, therefore, fairly conclude that in essay A we have the Torgau Articles, that is, the articles which were delivered to

* The same two-fold parallelism meets us already in *Die aelteste Redaktion der Augsburger Konfession*. Kolde.

the Elector of Saxony in answer to his requisition of March 14th, and which were used in composing Article XXI. and the Articles on Abuses, now contained in the Augsburg Confession. And when we come to compare the two sets of articles we find no difficulty in reaching the conclusion that the first part of Article XXI. of the Confession has its prototype in the article *Of the Invocation of Saints,* in the essay. The same may be said of Article XXII., in its correspondence with the article *Of Both Forms,* in the essay, and likewise of Article XXIII., as compared with the one of corresponding title in the essay, except that Article XXIII. is expanded greatly beyond the size of its prototype. There is resemblance also in Article XXIV. to the article *Of the Mass,* in the essay, though by no means is there identity in subject-matter, nor in the manner of treatment. The agreement between Article XXV., *Of Confession,* in the Augustana, and the article of the same title in the essay, is so striking as to make it almost certain that the latter is the antecedent, or first draft, of the former. Article XXVI., of the Confession, *Of the Distinction of Meats,* has no antecedent in title in the essay. It contains a few forms of statement that may be traced to the first article in the essay. But there is no necessary relation between the two. In Article XXVII., of the Confession, *Of Monastic Vows,* there are *points* of agreement with the article *De Votis, Von Closter leben,* in the essay, but the former contains about four times as much matter as does the latter. Article XXVIII., *Of the Power of the Bishops,* is the longest in the Confession. It covers a little more than eleven pages in the German *editio princeps,* as over against the article of similar title in the essay, which contains only 425 words. Brieger says that Article XXVIII. of the Confession contains not a trace from A. Engelhardt says that only the fundamental thought is the same, but that the entire treatment is different. Brieger declares that "the first sketch of Melanchthon's twenty-eighth article is found in C," whose first article is entitled: *Von vermöge der Schlussel. De potestate clavium.* Already Bretschneider had expressed the same opinion and had been followed by Engelhardt.* Kolde regards it as without doubt that here in C we have the original of Article XXVIII., of which we have three different recensions: that in Förstemann, that in *The Oldest Re-*

* C. R. IV., 1002. Bretschneider regards C as the work of which Melanchthon writes to Luther, May 22 (1530): *Nunc de potestate clavium etiam disputo.* C. R. II., 60. Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1856), pp. 562-564. *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* p. 286.

daction, and that in the Augsburg Confession.* Thus it becomes morally, though not demonstrably, certain that we have certain articles on "external ceremonies" and abuses, in other words, "Torgau Articles," which were used by Melanchthon in composing the second part of the Augsburg Confession. Whether these articles were all written at Wittenberg, March 14th to 27th, or some of them at Wittenberg and others at Augsburg,† is not a matter of great interest. But they were used by Melanchthon with such complete independence, both in matter and in manner, that after decades of the most critical examination and learned inquiry it can be only said: "A document bearing the title 'Torgau Articles,' or one which on the ground of contemporaneous reports can with complete certainty be designated as that delivered at that time, we do not possess. Hence the most diverse views have been published. Yet the researches of Engelhardt (*Niedner's Zeitschrift,* 1865, pp. 500 *et seqq.*), and especially those of Theodore Brieger (*Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* Leipzig, 1888, pp. 268 *et seqq.*), have rendered it in the highest degree probable that the much-sought 'Torgau Articles' are identical with a *Gutachten* (Förstemann, *Urkundenbuch,* I., pp. 68-84; Theodore Kolde, *Augsburgische Konfession,* p. 128 *et seqq.*), which, as an important document, was taken along by the Elector to Augsburg, and which became the foundation of the subsequent Confession." ‡

But now the question arises, Who is the author of this *Gutachten,* that is, of the Essay A? Bretschneider, Zöckler, Calinich, Plitt, Knaake, Virch, Brieger and Loofs unite in excluding Luther. Brieger says: "Luther is excluded by reason of the manner in which he is spoken of." § He alludes to the passage under *Of Ordination:* "It is to be apprehended that not many Dr. Martins will come after this time, who would control these important matters with such grace, and would avoid false doctrine and war." ‖ Knaake declares that Luther's part in the preparation for the Augsburg Confession must be confined to the Marburg and the Schwabach Articles.¶ Loofs says: "Not com-

* *Die Aelteste Redaktion der Augsburger Konfession,* pp. 63 *et seqq.*

† Brieger says: "Nothing indicates that this essay was presented at Torgau." Engelhardt agrees with Bretschneider; Plitt and Kolde unite in excluding C from the number of the "Torgau Articles."

‡ Kolde in *Real-Encyclopädie,*[3] II., p. 243. Article: *Augsburger Bekenntnis.*

§ *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* p. 310.

‖ Jacobs' *Book of Concord,* II., p. 83.

¶ *Luther's Antheil in der Augsburgischen Confession,* pp. 20-25.

posed by Luther.'' * Brieger, after excluding Luther, naturally turns to Melanchthon, though he does not regard him as the sole author, but thinks that he received suggestions from the other Wittenberg theologians, especially from Luther and Jonas. ''Yet these are only conjectures.'' † Calinich, after declaring that Essay A proceeded from Melanchthon, says: ''The Essay A is not from Luther.'' ‡

Considering the well-known fact that Melanchthon was generally, if not always, chosen as penman in the preparation of judgments and opinions to be delivered by the Wittenberg theologians, we will probably strike the truth by concluding that he wrote the ''Torgau Articles'' after consultation with Luther, Jonas and Bugenhagen, and that the said articles were carried to Torgau as a common answer to the Elector's requisition of March 14th.

* *Dogmengeschichte,* 4th ed., p. 818.
† *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* p. 310.
‡ *Luther und die Augsburgische Confession,* p. 28.

CHAPTER III.

THE JOURNEY TO AUGSBURG.

April 3, 1530, Luther, Melanchthon and Jonas left Wittenberg for Torgau. The following day the electoral train, consisting of one hundred and sixty persons, set out for Augsburg.* Among these were three princes, four counts and lords, seven noble counsellors, four learned counsellors, seven knights, seventy nobles and five theologians.† The rest were servants. They took with them three boxes containing civil and religious documents, among which, in all probability, were the Marburg Articles and the Schwabach Articles, and one bearing the title: *Judgment of the Learned at Wittenberg, which is to be presented to the Emperor in regard to ceremonies and things connected therewith,* which is generally supposed to be the Torgau Articles.‡ The train proceeded *via* Grimma, Altenburg and Isenburg to Weimar, which was reached on Saturday, the 9th, where the Elector was met by a messenger from Nürnberg, who announced that the Emperor was on his way to Germany and would certainly appear at Augsburg.§ On Palm Sunday, Luther preached at Weimar, and the Elector and some of his train partook of the Lord's Supper.‖ After resting a couple of days the party turned southward, and, passing through Gräfenthal and Neustädtlein, entered Coburg, on the southernmost limit of the Elector's dominion, on Good Friday, April 15th. "During the Easter festival Luther preached, as he is reported to have done in Weimar and Gräfenthal. He made scarcely any reference to questions of the day. He only declaimed most violently against the fanatics who, if they did not believe in the word of the sacrament, also could not believe on Christ the Son of God; as if it sufficed to warn the Elector once more against any association with the sacramentarians."¶

* Seckendorf, *Historia Lutheranismi,* II., 152.
† For names, see J. J. Müller, *Historie,* pp. 455-6.
‡ See Catalogue in Förstemann, I., 134-8.
§ Jonas, *Briefwechsel,* I., 145.
‖ Schirrmacher, *Briefe und Akten,* p. 372.
¶ Kolde, *Martin Luther,* II., 328.

1. *Luther Left at Coburg.*

The Electoral party remained at Coburg until April 23d, since some things had to be arranged in regard to the continuance of the journey, and especially in regard to Luther. Already, April 7th, the Elector had written from Isenburg to Nürnberg and had requested that renowned imperial city to receive Luther and to furnish him protection during the Diet, as he (the Elector) wished to have him in a place of safety, and, for the purpose of consultation, nearer at hand "than in our land," * that is, in Coburg. As the Elector found no answer to his letter awaiting him at Coburg, he wrote again, April 15th, and repeated the request of April 7th. But the next day, April 16th, Michael von Kaden came to Coburg to say that, April 13th, the Nürnberg Senate had decided not to receive Luther, nor to furnish him with a safe-conduct.† This piece of information at once determined the place of Luther's residence during the Diet.‡ It had been the Elector's intention, as shown in the correspondence, to take Luther as far as Nürnberg, or within about one hundred miles of Augsburg, in order that, as "opportunity offered," he might consult him in the transactions of the Diet. But such intention miscarrying, because of the attitude of the Nürnbergers, it was now decided to leave Luther at Coburg. Accordingly, on the morning of April 23d, about four o'clock, he was conveyed to the castle, which stands five hundred feet above the city and commands a wide prospect over Thuringian hills and valleys, and is so strong, by reason of its isolation and of its massive walls, that it resisted all the efforts of Wallenstein to capture it during the Thirty Years' War. It was the best that could be done under the circumstances. Luther was under the excommunication of the Pope and under the ban of the Empire. It was not expedient to take him to Augsburg. He was a subject for lawful arrest. In all probability he would have been assassinated on the spot. But while it is documentarily certain that the Elector and his counsellors wanted Luther nearer than Coburg, it is highly probable that they did not want him with them at Augsburg. At least, we meet with no expression of desire to

* Original given by Kolde in *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien*, pp. 155-7.

† Original in Kolde's *Analecta Lutherana*, p. 119.

‡ Von Kaden delivered this information *viva voce*, but he carried with him an instruction written by Lazarus Spengler, which gives many reasons why Luther could not be received at Nürnberg. Original given by Kolde in *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien*, pp. 257 *et seqq.* Very justly does Kolde say: "The Nürnbergers did not have the steadfastness and the courage to expose themselves to danger."

have him at Augsburg, and learn of no effort having been made to remove the obstacles that stood in the way of his going thither. There were, on the contrary, two personal reasons why Luther would have been *persona non grata* at Augsburg. He had come to be "hated" by the Electoral Prince John Frederick, who ascribed to Luther's influence much of the resolute opposition shown by the Elector to the Emperor.* His presence at Augsburg would have been intensely exasperating to the Romanists, and would have rendered negotiations more difficult. He was enthusiastic in defense of his cause, uncompromising in spirit, and violent in discussion. It would have been highly impolitic on the part of the Elector, and very hazardous to his expressed purposes of conciliation and fellowship with the opposite party, to take Luther to Augsburg. It would have been equivalent to a declaration of war. Hence one can easily see how the entire cause of Protestantism, which was now on trial, would have been brought into greater peril by allowing Luther to appear at the Diet. This must have been foreseen by the Elector and his counsellors.

Hence, after reading all the known contemporaneous documents relating to the detention of Luther at Coburg, we cannot resist the conclusion that, much as the Elector desired to have Luther as near as possible for consultation, he did not desire to have him at Augsburg to assist in the pending negotiations. Such also, essentially, is the conclusion expressed or intimated by not a few historians who cannot be justly accused of *tendenz,* nor of prejudices, nor of insufficient information; † and such a conclusion is in no sense contradicted by Luther's declaration: "It was not safe to take me to Augsburg," ‡ nor by his expressions of impatience with his detention at Coburg. It was not Luther's fault that he was not taken to Augsburg. The responsibility in the matter rests with the Elector, who had to

* See Melanchthon's letter to Luther, May 22d, in C. R., II. 61. St. Louis edition, *Luther's Schriften,* XVI., 689, note 3. An old translator of Melanchthon's letter says: "Denn er ist nun niemand ungnädiger als *euch.*" Some have interpreted this *hating* as referring to Philip of Hesse. The context will not sustain such an interpretation.

† Mathesius says: "For great and important reasons Doctor Luther was left at this castle (Coburg), lest the enemy should be rendered more bitter by his presence, and the chief cause should be brought into discredit." *Eighth Sermon.* See Pfaff *Geschichte des Augsb. Glaubensbek.* I., p. 198; Weber, *Krit. Gesch. A. C.,* I., p. 27; Strang, *Martin Luther,* p. 603; Facius, *Geschichte A. C.,* p. 42; Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865), p. 570; Koehler, *Journeys of Luther,* p. 284; Kahnis, *Dogmatik,* II., 423; "Personally too exasperating."

‡ De Wette, *Luther's Briefe,* IV., p. 27.

consider the peaceful issue of the Diet, as well as Luther's personal safety.

At all events, the Elector ordered Luther to remain at Coburg. Michael von Kaden explained to him, "briefly and very gently," the reasons why he could not be taken to Nürnberg; and von Kaden reports that Luther declared to him that his "original counsel had been that he be left at Wittenberg, since he did not believe that anything more would be accomplished at the pending Diet than had been accomplished at former ones." *

2. *The Journey Continued.*

April 22d, the Elector received a letter from the Emperor in which the latter declared that he would certainly reach Augsburg the last of the month. The next day the Elector and his party left Coburg, and, proceeding *via* Bamberg and Nürnberg, reached their destination May 2d. Luther was safe in the castle at Coburg. Yet his heart and his prayers went with his friends to the scene of danger and of testimony. Even on the first day of his residence in the castle, he wrote three letters, one to each of his three friends, Melanchthon, Jonas and Spalatin; but he makes no reference to the "Apology" and no serious reference to the Diet.† On the same day, namely, April 23d, he wrote to Winceslaus Link:" * "We are sitting here at Coburg, uncertain about the Diet and the coming of the Emperor. Perhaps you have more accurate information. My companions have gone to Augsburg, but the Prince wants me to stay here. You will see them, Philip, Jonas, Eisleben and Spalatin, in case the Diet is held." Also, on the same day, to Eoban Hess of Nürnberg: "I send you four living, speaking, most eloquent epistles. Gladly would I have been the fifth, but one said to me, Keep silent, you have a bad voice." ‡ There is no mistaking the meaning of this last sentence. Somebody, perhaps the Electoral Prince John Frederick, perhaps one of the electoral counsellors, had expressed

* See von Kaden's official report to the Nürnberg Senate in *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien*, p. 263. Von Kaden says *inter alia:* "I think my gracious lord, the Elector, will send Doctor *Martin* back to Wittenberg." It is evident that neither von Kaden nor the Elector gave Luther all the reasons why he could not be taken further, for April 18th he wrote to Nicholas Hausmann: "I am ordered by the Prince, while others go to the Diet, to remain at Coburg, nescio qua de causa. Thus all things are uncertain from day to day." De Wette, IV., p. 1. Certainly the Elector had not been explicit. See Kolde. *Kircheng. Studien*, p. 225, and Rinn, *Die Entstehung der A. C.*, p. 17.

† De Wette, *Luther's Briefe*, IV., 2, 3, 4, 12. For the correct date of these letters see Enders, *Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel*, VII., 304.

‡ De Wette, IV., 6.

an unwillingness to have Luther go to Augsburg, because his person would be very unacceptable to the opposite party. The explanation given by Engelhardt is as charitable as the facts will allow: "The meaning of the expression is not that they did not like his faith and his dogmatic views, but that they did not think him possessed of such gentleness and suavity as the proposed work of peace required. This, to be sure, was a second reason why the counsellors of the Elector agreed to leave him behind, but it was subordinate and entirely unessential for the question of theology." *

There is no proof that Luther was to be entirely ignored in the transactions of the Diet, though there is abundant reason for his complaint that he was neglected by his brethren at Augsburg, and it is certain, as will be hereafter shown, that he exerted little or no influence on the composition of the Augsburg Confession, or on his party, until long after the Confession had been delivered to the Emperor. But that he should be kept from Augsburg, because of his impetuosity, and because of his unfitness for negotiations, is just what prudence would seem to dictate. Luther was not the man to appear in diets. He was not sent to Speyer in 1529, notwithstanding the pacific resolutions of 1526; nor do we hear that he was ordered to Hagenau and to Worms in 1540, and to Regensburg in 1541. He could fight devils and fanatics, could tear up stumps and stones, but he was not endowed with the patience and tact of the diplomatist. In these practical talents he was greatly surpassed by Melanchthon, who in diets and conferences served the cause of the Reformation for thirty years with pre-eminent success.

3. *The Elector of Saxony's Confession of Faith.*

In 1884, Professor Theodore Brieger, then of Marburg, later of Leipzig, while examining the Despatches sent to Rome by Cardinal Campeggius in 1530, read with astonishment in the report made by the Cardinal at Innsbruck, May 12th, the following: "The Elector of Saxony has sent to the Emperor at Innsbruck a declaration of his faith, which, so far as I can learn, is entirely Catholic at the beginning, but full of poison in the middle and at the end." Says Brieger: "A most surprising account, that the Elector John sent a confession of faith to the Emperor already before the opening of the Diet. Undoubtedly, this step was taken upon advice of Count William of

* Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865), p. 570.

Nassau, given by him to the Elector's ambassador, Hans von Dolzig, at Dillenburg, near the end of March." *

The substance of this advice, as officially reported by Dolzig, is that the circumstances were such as to require that the Elector should send a conciliatory and complete report about the affairs of religion, to be laid before the Emperor and his counsellors prior to the opening of the Diet. In connection with this advice William and his brother, the Margrave Henry of Nassau, would act as mediators between the Elector and the Emperor. Also the report would have to be made in the Latin or in the French language (die lateynische oder welsche Sprach), since the Emperor and his attendants were not well acquainted with any other language.†

But instead of sending an account of the affairs of religion in his dominions to the Emperor, the Elector chose to send him a confession of his faith. The reason for this must be sought in the complete change of the theological situation. They had started to Augsburg with the expressed conviction that even their opponents had acknowledged that the doctrine taught was right and pure. They were now suddenly disabused of that delusion. Already, February 19, 1530, the Dukes of Bavaria, on learning that the Emperor had summoned a diet, commissioned the theological faculty of Ingolstadt "to bring together in epitome all the articles which had been promulgated by Luther during the last twelve years, and to show their disagreement with the true Christian faith, together with the way in which they could be most appropriately refuted, in order that the dukes, in case of need, might have this book in hand." ‡

Accordingly, the Ingolstadt theological faculty, notably Dr. John Eck, extracted four hundred and four articles from the writings of those "who disturb the peace of the Church," in which he indiscriminately denounces Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Carlstadt, the Anabaptists, as godless heretics, who scatter unnumbered errors of doctrine in all their books. "For to Luther we owe the new iconoclasts, the sacramentarians, the Capernians, the new Hussites, and their descendants, the Anabaptists, the new Epicureans, who declare that the soul is mortal, and the Spiritualists, and the new Cerinthians, who deny that

* *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* p. 312.

† See Dolzig's Report in Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch,* I., 127 *et seqq.*

‡ Original quoted by Winter in *Geschichte der Schicksale der Ev. Lehre in und durch Baiern,* p. 269. See Plitt, *Einleitung,* I., 527. Wiedemann's *Dr. Johann Eck,* pp. 580-1.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

Christ is God.''* These four hundred and four articles Eck, ''the humblest minister of the Church,'' offers to defend at Augsburg in the presence of the Emperor. A theological disputation is now imminent. The Elector, who had fallen in with Eck's articles, immediately on reaching Augsburg, or perhaps on the way thither, had discovered that the doctrinal teaching of his theologians would be impeached. A confession of his faith was what the circumstances required of the Elector, and consequently a confession of faith was forthcoming.

But for reasons which we do not know, the matter was conducted secretly. We find no allusions to it in the letters of the Elector's theologians and counsellors; and in the correspondence conducted between the Elector and his ambassadors at Innsbruck, and with Counts Henry and William of Nassau, and William of Neuenar, there is no expressed mention of a confession of faith; nor do we possess any written official report of the part acted by the counts as mediators; though there are allusions to certain transactions about the affairs of religion. But in the light of Professor Brieger's discovery, such allusions become perfectly intelligible, as does also the following passage in a letter written May 31st by Jacob Sturm of Strassburg to Zwingli: ''There is a report, and it is of such a nature that it does not seem to be wholly without foundation, that the *Saxon,* through ambassadors, has sent to the *Emperor at Innsbruck* certain articles, in which he confesses his faith, and has added that he will not depart from that confession, unless by clear testimonies of the Scripture he is convinced and is led to change his mind. If this be true, as I have learned from men worthy of confidence, I think they are the same, or not altogether different from those which Luther has recently had printed, and which you will receive through this messenger,'' †—meaning, of course, the Schwabach Articles.

But Professor Brieger did not make a copy of this ''evangelical confession.'' In reporting his discovery, he says: ''Since I was able to note only a few sentences, I cannot state the more exact relation of this confession to the Schwabach Articles, that is, I cannot say in what way the seventeen Schwabach Articles were changed into the fifteen here present.'' ‡

Fortunately, through the courteous assistance of several American Catholic scholars, we obtained a copy of this confession from

* A part of Eck's letter to the Emperor sent with the Articles.
† Zwingli's *Opera,* 8, p. 459.
‡ *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien für Reuter,* 1887, p. 312; *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1901.

the Secret Archives of the Pope in the year 1900, and published the same, with an English translation, in *The Lutheran Quarterly* for July, 1901.* Hence we are now in a position to show the exact relation which this confession sustains to the Schwabach Articles. We discover that the form of the Schwabach Articles used in the preparation of the Elector's Confession was not that published by Luther while residing at Coburg, which had not yet reached Augsburg; but an older form, one in all probability verbally in accord with the *original,* which was discovered by Elias Frick in the city archives at Ulm, and published by him in 1714, in his German Edition of Seckendorf's *Historia Lutheranismi,* pp. 968, *et seqq.,* published with diplomatic accuracy by Georg Gottlieb Weber in Vol. I. of his *Kritische Geschichte der Augspurgischen Confession,* 1783.† Hence it is with this form of the Schwabach Articles that we must compare the Elector's Confession, and when we make the comparison, we find, as observed by Brieger, that this confession agrees substantially with the Schwabach Articles, though there are forms of statement in the confession which cannot be called translations, but adaptations or changes made in view of the purpose which governed the mind of the Elector, and of his counsellors and theologians, from the day he resolved to go to Augsburg, to the day on which he left Augsburg, *the purpose of approximating to the Roman Catholic doctrine as closely as possible.* This becomes at once apparent in the change made in Article X., as the following comparison shows:

SCHWABACH ARTICLES.	THE ELECTOR'S CONFESSION.
The Eucharist or sacrament of the Altar also consists of two parts, viz., that there is truly present in the bread and in the wine, the true body and blood of Christ, according to the sound of the words: "This is my body, this is my blood," and that it is not only bread and wine, as even now the other side asserts. These words require and also convey faith, and also exercise it in all those who desire this sacrament, and do not act against it; just as Baptism also brings and gives faith, if it be desired.‡	That the Eucharist or sacrament of the altar also consists of two parts: Namely, that truly and substantially in bread and wine are present the true body and blood of Christ, according to those words: This is my body, this is my blood, and that by no means is it bread and wine, as, nevertheless, another party maintains. These words likewise require and implant faith, and strengthen it in all who desire that sacrament, and do not act contrary to it, as also Baptism brings and imparts faith if it be believed.

* Reprinted by E. Stange in *Studien und Kritiken,* 1903, pp. 345 *et seqq.*
† Second *Beylage.*
‡ Jacobs, *Book of Concord,* II., 72.

In Article IX. the Anabaptists are named, and their teaching is rejected. Article III. ends with the words: Lord of all creatures, and, therefore, contains only a little more than a third of the original, while Articles XI. and XV. of the Schwabach series do not appear in any form in the Elector's Confession. Such articles, in their evangelical form, as given in the Schwabach Articles—"that private confession should not be enforced by laws," and "that it is not necessary to enumerate all sins," and "that the doctrine which prohibits marriage and ordinary food and drink to priests, together with monastic life and vows of every kind, are nothing but damnable doctrines of devils"—such articles would have given mortal offense at Charles's court, and would have gone far to establish Eck's accusations. In Article XII., instead of "a holy Christian Church" (Art. XI., Schwabach) we have, very significantly, "one Holy Catholic Church;" and we find nothing to correspond to the declaration in Article XVI., that the Mass is the chief abomination. In a word, the Elector's Confession is a changed and *Catholicized* adaptation of the seventeen Schwabach Articles. Very much that is characteristic in those Articles, and distinctive as against the Roman Catholic teaching, is removed, and the whole confession faces in a direction not contemplated by the Schwabach Articles; though the Schwabach Articles, by their teaching on Baptism and their reference to the Anabaptists as the blasphemers of Baptism, and by their teaching on the Lord's Supper, were well calculated to refute Eck's charge that the Lutherans, the Anabaptists, and the Zwinglians taught alike on the sacraments.

But, in regard to this Confession of the Elector, we must conclude that it was put in its present shape very hastily, either immediately after the arrival in Augsburg, May 2d, or possibly on the way thither, after the electoral party had left Coburg, since it was laid before the Emperor about May 5th, and was considered at court May 8th.* That it did not make a favorable impression on the Emperor and on his counsellors, is evident from the fact that Campeggius has learned that it was regarded as full of poison in the middle and at the end. But that it should have fallen into oblivion, and should have remained unknown for more than three centuries and a half, is remarkable, when we consider the purpose for which it was prepared. And all

* Förstemann, I., 174, 180. Seckendorf, *Historia*, II., Sec. 56, Add. III. J. J. Müller, *Historie*, p. 476. Brieger, *Kircheng. Studien*, pp. 313-315.

that we know of its history is that it was prepared, was sent to Innsbruck, was delivered to the Emperor, was considered at the Imperial Court, and that it failed to conciliate the Catholics to the Lutherans. That it should have been based on the Schwabach Articles seems most natural, since only a few months earlier these articles, bearing the title: *Artickel vom Churfürst von Sachssen des glawens halb,* had been accepted by the Elector as his confession of faith, and had been used by his authority in an effort to unite the forces of Protestantism.

That the motive in the preparation of this confession was the desire to counteract the effect of Eck's Articles, there can be no doubt. The need now was that the Emperor should know what doctrines were taught under the protection of the Elector. Count William's advice would doubtless be remembered, but only indirectly and remotely could it have been responsible for this particular step on the part of the Elector. Eck's "most diabolical slanders,"* to use the words of Melanchthon, were the inciting cause of the preparation of this Confession, as they likewise were the exciting cause for the inclusion of Articles of Faith in the Augsburg Confession. And this confession has value now as the oldest known draft of the doctrinal articles of the Augustana, and possibly the form, real, or approximate, in which the doctrinal articles were sent to Luther, May 11th.† Hence we may say, that had the Emperor reached Augsburg early in May, or had the Elector of Saxony's Confession of faith been favorably received at Innsbruck, we would not to-day have the Augsburg Confession, but the Confession of the Elector of Saxony, as the ecclesiastical and religious result of the Diet of Augsburg. It was thus a fortunate circumstance for Lutheranism and for Protestantism that the Emperor's coming was delayed until a confession of faith could be elaborated, which represented all the Lutheran Estates gathered at that memorable Diet of Augsburg, in the year 1530. It was seven Lutheran Princes and two Lutheran cities that gave to the Church and to the world the Augsburg Confession, and by that act laid the foundation of the Lutheran Church.

* C. R. II., 45. Already, May 4th, Melanchthon had written to Luther about Eck's Articles. C. R. II., 39.

† See Knaake, *Luther's Antheil,* p. 77, and Ender's, *Luther's Briefwechsel,* VII., p. 331, note 2.

CHAPTER IV.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

THERE were valid personal reasons why Luther should not be chosen to draw up articles to be presented to the Emperor at the Diet. Articles composed by him would have been as offensive to the opposite party as his person was. They would also have borne the characteristic qualities of their author, and would have defeated the end in view, which was the restoration of peace and unity. Hence, very wisely has the judicious Weber written: "Since, according to the Imperial Rescript for the Diet at Augsburg, in 1530, the Emperor wished to remove all errors and disputes in matters of faith, and wished to hear the opinion and view of everyone, it was wise in the Elector not to turn over to Luther the further expansion of the articles composed by the theologians at Wittenberg, and to have him finish the articles which were to be delivered to the Emperor. For, since Luther had been outlawed by the Emperor, and could not even be taken to the Diet by the Elector, but had to be left at Coburg, would it have been wise in the Elector and his associates to desire to deliver to the Emperor a confession of which the outlawed Luther was known to be the author? Would Luther, full of enthusiasm for the truth, violent in controversy with his enemies, often incautious and insulting in speech, have been able to restrain himself in elaborating the Confession, when once he had to speak on the controverted doctrines and abuses of the Roman Church? Only read the Schmalkald Articles, composed for the Council of Mantua. Had he written the Confession in the same tone and spirit, considering the circumstances of the small band of Protestants at that time, could it have been read in the presence of the Emperor, Electors, Bishops and assembled Estates of the Empire? Would it not have increased the bitterness of the opposite party, and thus, humanly speaking, have brought greater injury than profit to the good cause? Valdesius said of Melanchthon's Confession, which he read before it was delivered to the Emperor, that it was so bitter that the opposite party would not tolerate it. What would he not have judged in the case of Luther's work? Even Cochlaeus, who compared the Schmalkald

Articles with the Confession, very correctly judged that it was far easier to listen to the latter, and that its words and thoughts were much less offensive than those of the former. Hence, it was well planned that Luther, with his fire and enthusiasm, who, when the truth was involved, cared as little for a king as for a stupid priest, in a matter so delicate as the affair of religion at that time, should not be allowed to speak before the Emperor and the Empire. For truth, when it has to contend with prejudice, operates more effectively on the human heart when it appears in modest, pleasing attire, than when it appears in a course, rasping dress, which really discredits it, and exasperates and incenses, rather than conciliates the votary of prejudice. Therefore, the work was given over by the Elector to Melanchthon; for he, not less than Luther, was a friend of truth, had a much calmer soul, was gentle and modest, and with the beautiful and pleasing style, in which he surpassed the theologians of his time, knew how to speak the truth without, in the least, compromising it, and without exasperating the opposite party." *

1. *Melanchthon's State of Mind in 1530.*

But it is important here and now to inquire into Melanchthon's state of mind in the year 1530, in order rightly to interpret his conduct at Augsburg, and to ascertain the meaning of the Confession which he produced.

He carried with him to Augsburg the mind common at that time to all of the Electoral party—the mind bent on conciliation and on reconciliation. This mind is clearly indicated, if not positively expressed, in the Torgau Articles, and in the Preface (exordium) to the Confession. He considered that neither he nor his fellow-Lutherans had separated themselves from the Catholic Church, but that they were members of the same. Consequently, they must maintain and obtain their rights within the Church. Besides, Melanchthon was an absolute imperialist. He reverenced the Emperor with a veneration that bordered on idolatry. He looked on him as one of those fabled heroes or demigods, that in olden times were believed to walk among men. He esteemed him endowed with all civil, domestic and Christian virtues, and applied to him the lines in which Horace describes the Emperor Augustus:

* *Kritische Geschichte der Augsb. Conf.*, I., 26 *et seqq.* Virch in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1888), p. 73.

Hoc nihil majus meliusve terris
Fata donaverunt, bonique Divi:
Nec dabunt, quamvis redeant in aurum
Tempora priscum.*

He hated the democratic principles of the Swiss with a perfect hatred, and believed that they were trying to draw the Lutherans into their schemes. Philip of Hesse, he called *Antiochus*. Besides, in his estimation, the Swiss held *dogmata intolerabilia*, and had formed *insidiosissima consilia*. Under these circumstances, and with his imperialistic and patristic predilections, he conceived that both he and his party stood very near to the Catholic Church and to the Emperor. Hence, apart from union with the Church and the Emperor, he foresaw only wars, bloodshed, devastation, civil and religious commotions.†

Success on the part of Philip, and of the Swiss, would utterly defeat the purpose and the desire of his party to obtain and to enjoy their rights within the Church. Joined to these things were also the jealousies of the theologians, and the *imbecilitas animi* of the Princes, about which he afterwards so bitterly complained;‡ and also Eck's four hundred and four Articles (described in the preceding chapter), in which the doctrines of the Lutherans were identified with all ancient and modern heresies.

Such, beyond all question, as shown by his own letters, was the mental attitude of Melanchthon at Augsburg, in the year 1530. *On the one hand he stood, almost with the devotion of a martyr, by the Empire and by the Church.*§ *On the other hand, he opposed, with the intensity of religious conviction, the political schemes and the "opposite" doctrines of the Anabaptists and the Swiss, whom he practically identified as aiming to overthrow the Church and the Empire.*||

Unless we take these facts into consideration, we cannot understand the position of Melanchthon at Augsburg, nor gain a proper viewpoint for interpreting the purpose and meaning of the Augsburg Confession as Melanchthon conceived it and composed it.¶

* *Carminum Liber*, IV., II. C. R. II., 430 *et seqq.*

† See *The Lutheran Quarterly*, Oct., 1900, p. 489. Ellinger, *Philipp Melanchthon* (1902), pp. 283-285. Hoennicke, *Melanchthon's Stellung auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg 1530*, in *Deutsch Ev. Blätter*, Nov., 1908.

‡ *Melanchthon. Paedagogica*, p. 38. C. R. II., 314. See also Kawerau, *Kirchengeschichte III.*, Dritte Auflage, p. 101, who says: "The Saxons of the Electorate were far more inclined to come to an understanding with Ferdinand than with the Swiss."

§ See his letters to Campeggius, C. R. II., 81 and 170.

|| See C. R. II., 104; XXIII., 749.

¶ "War die Konfession, welche der Kurfürst von Sachsen in seinem und

Hence Melanchthon's concessions at Augsburg—in the Confession, in his correspondence with Campeggius, in the peace negotiations—did not proceed from personal weakness, but from an honest desire to serve his party, to carry out their determination to remain in the Church, to vindicate the Lutherans from identification with the Zwinglians and the Anabaptists, and to maintain the integrity of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation.

2. *Melanchthon is Chosen.*

Now, it was while Melanchthon was in the frame of mind described above, that he was chosen to write an "Apology," to be used in defense of the Elector before the Diet. That the Elector was influenced by some such considerations as those named by Weber, can scarcely be questioned, when we take into the account the circumstances and the differences in the dispositions and talents of Luther and Melanchthon.

At all events, Melanchthon was chosen—certainly not without good and sufficient reasons; and this action on the part of the Elector and his counsellors, made Melanchthon for the time being the theological leader of the reforming party, as the Elector was its political leader. That Melanchthon occupied such a position is seen in the numerous opinions written by him at Augsburg, and in the fact that the *Bedenken,* brought by other theologians to Augsburg, were turned over to him for examination; that the Nürnberg commissioners report his actions, and that he held interviews with Schlepper and Valdesius, the Imperial Secretaries. Never was leadership more wisely bestowed; never were its duties more conscientiously and faithfully executed; and it came to him so naturally and so fittingly that neither Luther, nor any one of the other theologians journeying together to Augsburg, has left on record a single word of complaint. Three hundred and eighty years of after-thought have justified the wisdom of the selection. Melanchthon's moderation, learning, culture, and his familiarity with the Wittenberg teaching, pointed him out as the man best fitted to draw up whatever writing was to be laid before the Diet. There can be no doubt that the selection was entirely acceptable to Luther, and that

seiner lutherischen Glaubensgenossen Namen am 25. Juni vor Kaiser und Reich verlesen liess, im Sinne äusserster Annährung an die alte Kirche und schroffster Absonderung von den Zwinglischen gehalten, so ging Melanchthon in den später geführten Verhandlungen noch sehr weit über diese Linie hinaus." Baumgarten, *Geschichte Karls V.*, 3, p. 28.

Luther assisted him by his counsel, so long as the two remained together at Coburg.

3. *Melanchthon Writes the Preface at Coburg.*

While the electoral party was sojourning at Coburg, April 15th to April 23d, Melanchthon wrote the "long and rhetorical preface"* or introduction to the Articles on Abuses. Formerly it was thought by some theologians that by Preface (exordium) is to be understood Part First of the Confession, or the Articles of Faith, which were intended to introduce the Articles on Abuses. But it was seen by those who took a deeper and more critical look into the Torgau Articles, that such a theory was utterly inconsistent with the declaration that the enemies of the Reformation themselves approved the Wittenberg doctrine as pure and right, and that "the dissension now is especially concerning some abuses, which have been introduced by human doctrine and statutes, of which we will report in order, and indicate for what reasons my lord is induced to cause certain abuses to be abated." But now, by the discovery and publication of *The Oldest Redaction of the Augsburg Confession,*† such theory in regard to the Preface is utterly and forever exploded, for here we have that identical Preface, which up to June 1, 1530, at least, stood at the head of the Confession—Articles of Faith and Articles on Abuses—in so far as, at that time, it had been written.

This Preface is "long and rhetorical." It covers seven printed pages *octavo,* and is of the nature of an oration addressed to the Emperor Charles the Fifth. It speaks wholly in the name of the Elector of Saxony and is sycophantically apologetic in tone and in contents. "It begins," as Dr. Kolde says, "with a very evident captatio benevolentiae." It declares that the Elector places his hope and trust, next to God, in the mildness and goodness of the Emperor, who has always sought the peace of Europe, and that, too, without showing a trace of pride or of arrogance, or of desire for blood; also that nothing could be more acceptable to God than that the Emperor should employ his power for promoting the unity of Christendom, as had been formerly done by Theodoric, by Charles the Great and by Henry II., since the Holy Spirit admonishes Princes to take

* Förstemann, *Urkundenbuch,* I., 68.

† Discovered in the Nürnberg Archives in July, 1905, by Drs. Schornbaum and Kolde, and published by the latter, July, 1906. See *The Lutheran Quarterly,* January, 1907.

an interest in the Faith; that the Electors of Saxony, Frederick and John, have never favored new doctrines, and have always been loyal to the Roman Emperors, and have sought the peace and unity of Germany. When indulgences were preached in Saxony, "Martin Luther spoke in opposition through a few small treatises in the school, and not before the people, and without abusing and maligning the Pope." But Luther's enemies attacked him in both languages and compelled him to reply. The Anabaptists had raised various disputes and had opposed the secular government, had denied the rights of private property and had declaimed against the preaching of the word, and against the sacrament. They had been opposed by Luther. The ceremonies are not abolished, "but much rather are they observed with the true fear of God, and in truth it may be said that not in all Germany is the Mass held with greater fear of God, and with a better understanding on the part of the people than among us." "The sacrament is received by the people with greater reverence and more frequently than heretofore," etc.

"Confession is still maintained, and the power of the Keys is much praised in preaching, and the people are admonished in regard of the great value of absolution."

"The preaching is pure and intelligible, and this is unquestionably the chief sacrifice before God."

The useful ceremonies are still maintained and also the festival days. The ordinances in the Electorate of Saxony "are, for the most part, according to the old usages and customs of the Roman Church, as shown in the holy doctrine."

The Preface closes thus: "We will now speak of doctrine, and will first recount the chief articles of faith, from which the Emperor can see that the Elector of Saxony has permitted nothing unchristian to be preached in his dominion, but has with all diligence held fast to the common pure Christian faith."

We must say of this Preface that it is painfully apologetic from beginning to end. It proposes to place the settlement of the entire dispute and contention about religion in the hands of the Emperor. It makes no reference whatever to the Emperor's promise (in the Rescript by which he summoned the Diet) that "the opinion and view of each one should be taken up and carefully considered." It proposes to make the Emperor arbiter; and it denies that any new doctrines have been intro-

duced in the churches of the Electorate of Saxony. In a word this Preface evades the entire issue on which the German Reformation justifies and forever must justify itself, namely, the matter and question of *Doctrine,* for if the German Reformation be not a *doctrinal* protest and a *doctrinal* revolution as over against the *doctrinal* teaching of the Roman Catholic Church (and no other Church was at that time in the purview), at the beginning of the sixteenth century, then it had not at the beginning, and never has had, a right to exist, since on its own principle, laid down in Article VII. of the *Augustana,* the true unity of the Church consists in the *purity of doctrine,* and not in "uniform ceremonies instituted by men." Indeed, the Lutheran Church might tolerate every *ceremony qua ceremony* of the Roman Catholic Church, were it not for the *doctrine* that lies back of, informs, determines, and expresses itself through the ceremony, for as Guericke has well said, in speaking of the Church: "Its external phase, or constitution and worship, is for the most part, the necessary fruit and effect of the inner principle of doctrine and creed." And as a matter of fact, the German Reformation took its start in antagonism to the doctrinal teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. The *Ninety-five Theses* attacked the *doctrine* of Indulgences. Luther's *Three Great Reformation Writings* of the year 1520: *The Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation, On Christian Liberty, On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church,* which together contain the promise and potency of the entire German Reformation, are attacks on the most fundamental principles and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. He had called the Pope Antichrist and the Church a harlot; he had enunciated the doctrine of justification *by faith alone,* and had reiterated it a thousand times and in a thousand forms; he had taught a new doctrine of the sacraments, of the Church, of the ministry; he had revolutionized the service of worship both in its fundamental conception and in its forms. All these things had he done prior to the year 1530. Melanchthon had written the *Loci Communes,* which Luther had endorsed as "an invincible book," and had prepared the *Visitation Articles,* which had been approved by Luther and Bugenhagen, and which had been accepted by the Elector of Saxony as a basis for the reformation of the churches in his dominions. In a word, the doctrine which now, for at least a decade, had been taught in the Electorate of Saxony, was as different from the doctrine that had been

taught there two decades earlier, as John Gerhard's *Loci Theologici* is different from the *Summa Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas.

But Melanchthon writes, and the Elector and his counsellors accept, and Luther endorses, this "long and rhetorical Preface," which, to say the least, is an evasion of the fundamental questions at issue between the Protestants and the Roman Catholic Church, namely, the *doctrinal* questions; and it is not too much to say, that, had this Preface been adopted by the Protestant Princes, assembled at Augsburg in 1530, and delivered by them to the Emperor, there would have remained no more of the German Reformation, and there would be no Lutheran Church to-day, for reconciliation on the basis of this Preface and of the Articles on Abuses would have been easy, had the Lutherans been able to convince the Emperor, and the Pope, and the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, that this Preface was a correct representation of the affairs of the churches in Germany, that is, that the Lutherans had attacked no doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, and had introduced no new doctrines, that is, no doctrines that differed from the then current doctrinal teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, and had only abolished a few abuses in ceremonies which had been introduced without the consent of the Church.

This "long and rhetorical Preface" was first written by Melanchthon at Coburg. May 4th he wrote to Luther from Augsburg: "I have made the Preface (exordium) somewhat more rhetorical than I had written it at Coburg."* What is meant by the words "somewhat more rhetorical" we have no means of ascertaining, nor do we know the form of the Preface at this time. We know it only in the form in which it was sent to Nürnberg, June 3d,† though great doubt was entertained about it May 31st.‡ Subsequently it was abandoned, and was lost sight of entirely until its discovery in July, 1905, as already noted, when it appears followed by Articles of Faith, in view of which, undoubtedly, the last paragraph, quoted above, was written.

4. *The Articles of Faith.*

When Melanchthon wrote to Luther about the Preface, May 4th, he gave no intimation that he contemplated the introduction of Articles of Faith into the "Apology," though he had

* C. R. II., p. 40. † C. R. II., 83. ‡ C. R. II., 78.

already seen Eck's booklet,* which he describes as "a big batch of propositions." On the 11th of May he wrote to Luther as follows: "Our Apology has been sent to you, though it is more properly a confession. For the Emperor will not have time to hear long discussions. Nevertheless I have said those things which I thought would be especially profitable and appropriate. With this purpose I have included about all the Articles of Faith, because Eck has published the most diabolical slanders against us. Against these I wished to present a remedy. Determine in regard to the whole writing in accordance with your spirit." †

During the week from May 4th to May 11th, Melanchthon had prepared "Articles of Faith" and had inserted them between the Preface and the Articles on Abuses. This action changed the "Apology" into a confession, though the whole document was yet often called *Apology*. The reason given for including Articles of Faith is clearly enough stated by Melanchthon. It was the slanders contained in Eck's four hundred and four Articles. The reason was the same as that which had determined the Elector to send a confession of his faith to the Emperor. He has discovered, as the Elector had, that the theological situation had changed. The "long and rhetorical Preface" and the Articles on Abuses will not meet the emergency. The doctrinal teaching of Luther especially, and also of Melanchthon, had been attacked, and they had been accused of heretical teaching on almost every subject of the Christian doctrine, and had been willfully confounded with all kinds of heretics, both ancient and modern. There was only one safe and proper course to take. Articles of Faith alone could furnish a "remedium." Thus Eck's Articles were the inciting cause of "the Articles of Faith," which changed the proposed Apology into a Confession of Faith. Of this there can be no doubt, and of this no competent writer on the genesis of the Augsburg Confession entertains a doubt as over against the supposition formerly entertained by some writers "in confessional rather than in historical interest," that the Doctrinal Articles constituted the Preface. Melanchthon himself has spoken on this subject in giving an account of the composition of the Confession, the fullest and the most explicit that ever came from his pen. He says: "Also some papal writers had scattered slander in the Diet, by which abominable lies were heaped on our churches, as that they had many damnable errors, and, like the Anabaptists,

* C. R. II., 39.

† C. R. II., 45.

were heretical and seditious. Now an answer had to be made to the Emperor; and for the refutation of the slanders it was resolved that all the Articles of Christian doctrine should be brought together in order, so that everyone might know that our churches were unjustly accused by these papal slanders.'' * Also in the Preface to the Latin *Corpus Doctrinae:* ''I brought to gether with simple purpose the principal points of the Confession that is extant, embracing about the sum of the doctrines of our churches, both that an answer might be made to the Emperor, and that false accusations might be refuted.''†

We know, then, how it came about that we have ''Articles of Faith'' in the Augsburg Confession, but we do not know how many such Articles the Confession contained in this first draft, mentioned, May 11th. We know, however, that it was very far from having the number that it now contains. In *The Oldest Redaction,* which represents the condition of the Confession, May 31st, we find Articles of Faith numbered from one to eighteen, though there is no article 14 appearing between Zum 13 and Zum 15, so that in reality there are only seventeen articles, all told. There is no article on *Church Government,* and no articles that correspond to Articles XX. and XXI. in the final form of the Confession. Certainly it was in a much more inchoate condition, May 11th, for May 22d Melanchthon writes to Luther: ''In the *Apology* we change many things daily. The article on vows I have removed because it was too brief, and I have supplied its place with another on the same subject somewhat longer. I am now treating also of the power of the Keys. I wish you would run over the Articles of Faith. If you think there is nothing defective in them, we will treat the rest as best we can. For they must be changed and adapted to circumstances.'' ‡

Twenty days after Melanchthon had sent the first draft to Luther, the Confession still appears very inchoate, as compared with the form in which it was presented to the Emperor. The Articles of Faith, in phraseology, in content and in extent, differ widely from those of the Confession as it appeared, June 25th. A brief description will suffice to make the difference evident. Article IV., which in some sense corresponds to Article V. in the completed Confession, reads as follows: ''The Holy Ghost is given by means of the Word and the sacraments, as Paul

* Preface to the German *Corpus Doctrinae.*
† C. R. IX., 1050 *et seqq.*
‡ C. R. II., 60.

says: Faith cometh by hearing. Here are rejected the Anabaptists and the like who despise the Word and the sacraments, and think that the Holy Ghost is acquired by human preparation." Article V. treats of Justification, but with verbal and material differences. Particularly do we notice *durch Christum*, "through Christ," instead of *um Christus willen*, "for the sake of Christ," which is so characteristic of the Lutheran conception of Christ's relation to our forgiveness and restoration to the favor of God. Article VII. aims to cover the content of Articles VII. and VIII. in the completed Confession. Of Article VIII., on Baptism, Professor Kolde says: "Article 8 has, manifestly, a purpose entirely different from that of the article which subsequently took its place. Hence, originally, it was not Melanchthon's intention to treat generically of Baptism in the Confession, but only of the *necessity of Infant Baptism.*" * In a literal translation the article reads as follows: "That little children should be baptized, and that by Baptism they are presented to God and are received into grace. Here again are rejected the Anabaptists, who say that Baptism does not profit children, and that little children are saved even without Baptism." The Article on the Lord's Supper is as follows: "9. That the body and blood of Christ are truly ['in the Supper among those who' is interlined] and are administered in the Supper, and those are rejected who teach otherwise." Kolde thinks that *vescentibus*, "to those who eat," was in the original, but was omitted because of the difficulty of translating it.

"10. That private absolution should be held in the Church, although in confession it is not necessary that all sins should be enumerated, for that is impossible." In the articles on *Civil Polity*, on *The Return of Christ to Judgment*, and on *Free-will*, the differences between this *Oldest Redaction* and the Confession in its final form are great and striking. Of the article on *The Return of Christ to Judgment*, "the construction is entirely different," remarks Kolde.

In general it may be said of the chief Articles of Faith in this *Oldest Redaction*, that they contained much that is ambiguous, vague and evasive, and that they incline much more to the traditional Roman Catholic doctrine than does the Confession in the form in which it was officially read and delivered.

If we turn to the Articles on Abuses, we find, indeed, that they

* *Die Aelteste Redaktion*, p. 51.

are seven in number, and that they treat in general the same subjects that are treated under the head of Abuses in Part II. of the completed Confession, but the treatment is in many particulars very different, and in extent the articles are scarcely more than two-thirds of what they are in the completed Confession. Still we are not brought back to that first draft of the Confession of which Melanchthon writes, May 11th, and which was sent to Luther for his inspection. We probably stand about half way between the finished Confession and that first draft, called by the Germans *Der erste Entwurf, Der fertige Entwurf, Prima Adumbratio.*

On this subject Professor Kolde has wisely written: "Since Melanchthon liked better to write Latin than German, and as, since from many indications, it may be concluded that the Latin recension was relatively finished earlier than the German, it is quite probable that Luther saw only the Latin. However, against this speaks the consideration that it was the Elector who sent the Apology to him, and who must have first read and approved it. Accordingly so long as no opposing proof can be adduced, it is *probably* to be concluded that Luther saw both recensions, in so far as they were finished.

"But what was at that time really finished? As regards the number of articles seen by him, my investigations have anew established only this, namely, that Articles XX. and XXI. were yet wanting.* More important is the inquiry about the content and shape of the articles as they were laid before him. On this subject nothing can be said with absolute certainty, but we will be justified in holding about the following as the facts:

"The comparison of Na *(The Oldest Redaction)* with A *(The Augsburg Confession)* proves conclusively that the articles underwent great changes during the last two or three weeks before delivery. We cannot prove that Luther saw the form in Na; much rather does everything go to show that the text sent to him underwent manifold changes already before Na was finished. Finally, in the correspondence between Augsburg and Coburg there is not an iota of evidence that Luther exerted any influence on the later changes, or that any one of the later recensions was sent to him. Hence, the direct participation

* In regard to Part II. it is certain that it was quite different from what it is in the completed Confession. Every article was changed even after May 31st. May 22d Melanchthon was revising Art. XXVII., and was probably writing for the first time Article XXVIII. See Brieger in *Kircheng. Studien,* p. 278. *Real-Encyc.,*[3] II., p. 244.

of Luther in the composition of the Confession—about which there has been discussion from time to time, finally again forty or fifty years ago, more in confessional than in scientific historical interest—is relatively small. Luther did help to draw up the Torgau Articles, and did also, as is certainly evident, counsel with Melanchthon before the Diet on all else that could come into consideration, and he even raised no objection to what he saw in May. But that also is all."*

The facts show conclusively, that, barring the "long and rhetorical Preface," the Apology *verius* Confession, as sent to Luther, May 11th, did not contain more than about one-half as much matter as is contained in the Augsburg Confession as it was read and delivered to the Emperor, June 25th. Besides, judging from what we find in *The Oldest Redaction,* the form of all the articles sent to Luther, and, in many cases, the matter and the conception of articles, were subsequently so manifoldly and so purposefully changed and elaborated as to produce an entirely different document. It can therefore be truthfully affirmed that the Confession, as Luther saw it before its delivery, was only the first draft of the Confession as it was at the time of its delivery. The document was changed daily and was adapted to circumstances.†

4. *Melanchthon Continues to Change.*

Melanchthon went on with his changes.‡ May 28th the Nürnberg commissioners, Kress and Volkamer, wrote home to their Senate "that the counsellors and theologians of the Elector are holding daily sessions on the Confession of Faith, with the purpose of giving it such a form that it cannot be passed over, but must be heard."§ Three days later they write that "the Saxon Confession is not yet completed," and that they have received the articles in Latin, in so far as they have been

* *Die Aelteste Redaktion,* pp. 73-75. See also Brieger, *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien,* p. 278; Kolde, *Augsb. Konf.,* p. 5, note 6.

† C. R. II., 60.

‡ Fikencher, after quoting Luther's letter of May 15th to the Elector, De Wette, 4. p. 17, says: "But Melanchthon was not yet satisfied with it (the Confession), and almost up to the moment of delivery he changed so much by additions and omissions, by remodeling, and by the introduction of entirely new articles, even by the choice of words, that a very different work resulted, though still based on the Torgau Articles. On each part, as finished, Melanchthon received the opinions of the theologians present. He even wrote to Luther, May 22d, for his opinion. But he (Luther) did not see the finished work until after it had been delivered to the Emperor." *Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg,* p. 53.

§ C. R. II., 71.

brought together, but without the Preface and the Conclusion, about which there is the greatest doubt; and that they will send the German copy, on which improvements are daily being made, so soon as it is finished.* June 8th these same commissioners write that the Saxons have not yet finished the Preface and the Conclusion.† June 15th they write: "The Saxon Confession of Faith is finished in German. Herewith we send it to you. It does not yet have the Preface and the Conclusion, and, as Philip Melanchthon has stated, he has not put any part of these into German, because he thinks that this same Preface and Conclusion may probably be presented, not alone in the name of the Elector, but in common in the name of all the Lutheran Princes and estates, as he has already made a change in the German Articles, as you will see: Namely, where in the Latin it is stated, that in the Electorate of Saxony, this or that is preached and held, here in the German he has omitted the Electorate of Saxony, and has put a common term in its place, which may refer to all the estates." ‡

But the Confession is not completed in German. It does not have the Preface and the Conclusion, nor Article XXI.: *Of the Worship of Saints.*§ "The Article, *Of Faith and Good Works,* placed last in the German Confession is not in the Latin Confession," write the Nürnberg commissioners. And Part II., as shown by the Spalatin Manuscript in the Weimar Archives, is manifoldly different from the Confession in its completed form. To say nothing about the brevity of some of the articles, it does not contain Article VIII., *Of The Power of the Bishops,* in any form. It may possibly be that this is the "Conclusion" which the Nürnberg commissioners say is lacking.|| Even in the

* June 3d, these Nürnberg Commissioners received also a copy of the Preface to the Latin Articles. They had both the Preface and the Articles transcribed by Jerome Ebner's sons, and they sent both to their Senate, saying, in a letter: "It lacks an article or two behind, and also the conclusion, on which the Saxon theologians are still working." C. R. 78. This Latin copy, sent to the Nürnberg Senate, was translated for the Senate by Hieronimus J. Baumgartner. This translation is *The Oldest Redaction of the Augsburg Confession,* about which we have written on pp. 50 *et seqq.*

† C. R. II., 87.

‡ C. R. II., 105.

§ Kolde says: "The (21) Article, *Of the Worship of Saints,* was originally written in Latin. The form that was subsequently placed in the Spalatin text is only a translation from the Latin. It appeared first in the I. Marburg and then in the French translation made from that. The German recension, which went to Nürnberg on the 15th, did not contain it." Engelhardt says: "Article XXI. was added after June 16th." Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865), p. 600.

|| The Spalatin Manuscript is regarded as the oldest form of the *German* Text of the Articles of Faith that has come down to us. In this, both Kolde

Articles of Faith there are numerous, though mostly stylistic, differences between Spalatin's Manuscript and the Confession as delivered. But Melanchthon proceeds with his changes and his adaptations, so that by the time the Confession is delivered it has become very different from what it is as given in Spalatin's Manuscript, to say nothing about the first draft, which was sent to Luther, and *The Oldest Redaction* of May 31st. The "long and rhetorical Preface" disappears entirely, and a diplomatic common Preface is written in German and translated into Latin by Justus Jonas. The Epilogue is added*, and the Epilogue-Prologue, beginning, "This is about the sum of the doctrine," which connects Part I. of the Confession with Part II., is inserted. That is, neither of these important sections of the Augsburg Confession appears yet in the Spalatin Manuscript,† so late, say, as the middle of June.

and Brieger agree. The latter says: "Of Spalatin's copy, it can only be said that it arose *before* the 15th of June." *Zur Geschichte des Augsburger Reichstags von 1530*, p. 17. Kolde, *Die aelteste Redaktion*, pp. 69, 70. Brieger regards the I. Ansbach as dating some days later, p. 18. The Spalatin MS. is given by Förstemann, I., 312-343.

* C. R. II., 112.

† See Förstemann, *ut supra*, I., 322 and 342.

CHAPTER V.

THE MATERIALS USED IN COMPOSING THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

We need not detain ourselves with any further consideration of the "long and rhetorical Preface," since that forms no part of the Augsburg Confession. We have already seen that Part II. of the Confession was elaborated by Melanchthon out of the alleged Torgau Articles, but with so many changes, that their identity almost disappears, and the "Articles on the Abuses that have been changed" are, to all intents and purposes, new articles. It remains that we should here consider the sources of the twenty-one Doctrinal Articles, as they are generally called, or according to the title given by Melanchthon in the Latin *editio princeps: The Principal Articles of Faith.*

1. *The Marburg and the Schwabach Articles.*

October 4, 1529, Luther wrote fifteen Articles at Marburg, which, because of the place of composition, are called the Marburg Articles.* They discuss the following subjects: 1. The Trinity; 2. The Person of Christ; 3. The Work of Christ; 4. Original Sin; 5-7. Justification by Faith; 8. The Spoken Word; 9. Baptism; 10. Good Works; 11. Confession; 12. The Magistracy; 13. Human Ordinances; 14. Infant Baptism; 15. The Lord's Supper.†

But already, perhaps more than two months earlier, he had helped to write seventeen Articles of Faith at the command of the Elector of Saxony, which, because they were used at Schwabach, October 16th-18th following, are called *The Schwabach Articles.*‡ They discuss the following objects: 1. The Trinity; 2. The Incarnation of the Son of God; 3. The Work of Christ; 4. Original Sin; 5. Justification by Faith; 6. Faith the Gift of God; 7. The Preached Word; 8. The Two Sacraments; 9. Baptism;

* Luther's *Werke*, Erl. Ed. 65, pp. 88 *et seqq.* Fac simile of the Original in *Studien und Kritiken* (1883), pp. 400 *et seqq.* Kolde, *Augsb. Konf.*, I. *Beilage.*

† Kolde, *Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte*, pp. 94 *et seqq.*

‡ Luther's own edition in Erl. Ed. of Works, 24: 334 *et seqq.* From the Ulm MS. in Weber, *Krit. Geschichte*, I., Appendix. On the basis of the Strassburg Official Text in Kolde, *Augsb. Konf.*, II. *Beilage.*

10. The Eucharist; 11. Private Confession; 12. The Christian Church; 13. Christ's Return to Judgment; 14. The Magistracy; 15. Monastic Vows and other Prohibitions; 16. The Mass; 17. Ceremonies of the Church. Both series of articles were written in German. Luther denies that he composed the Schwabach Articles alone. We may therefore conclude that he was assisted in their composition by Melanchthon and Justus Jonas, who were his faithful helpers at Wittenberg. Nevertheless, they bear the characteristic qualities of Luther's mind, and express his views on all the subjects embraced by them.

Now these two series of articles were taken to Augsburg by the Elector of Saxony. The former series is expressly mentioned under the title: *Acts and Decision of the Learned at Marburg,* Anno MC. XXIX., as being in the red chest, to which allusion has been already made. We know that the other was taken thither, because we find it employed by the Elector immediately upon his arrival at Augsburg as the basis of his Confession of Faith described in a preceding chapter. It is well known that the former series was signed by Zwingli and his followers, as well as by Luther and his followers, at Marburg. The other series was not signed by Luther, nor by any of the Wittenberg, theologians, but they were subsequently acknowledged by Luther in a bold and defiant Preface at their appearance in print in May, 1530. If we compare the two series with each other, we shall find that the Marburg Articles express the Lutheran doctrine in mild and conciliatory language. No attack is made upon any teaching or doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. Only an allusion to the same is made in articles eleven and twelve. In the Schwabach Articles the tone is decidedly polemical against Rome, as in Article XV., where it is declared "that the doctrine which prohibits marriage and ordinary food and drink to priests, together with monastic life, and vows of every kind, are nothing but damnable doctrines of devils;" and in Article XVI., where the Mass is characterized as "before all abominations." In Article IV. Luther's doctrine that "original sin is truly and properly sin" is brought out in contrast with the alleged Zwinglian view that it is "only a weakness or defect." In Article X. Luther specially affirmed his doctrine of the true presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist as against "the other side," the Zwinglians, who "assert" that only bread and wine are present.

Hence, the Schwabach Articles must be regarded as a more

positive and antithetical exhibition of Luther's teaching, than the Marburg Articles, and as corresponding perfectly to the state of Luther's and Melanchthon's mind during the Summer of 1529.

When now it became necessary to change the "Apology" into a Confession, because of Eck's calumniations, it was natural, as well as in accordance with Melanchthon's spirit, that recourse should be had to these two series of articles, both of which were at hand. The former he had subscribed, and the latter he had undoubtedly helped to compose. Both were official documents.

Moreover, the latter was titled: *The Elector of Saxony's Articles Concerning Faith,* and had been employed by the Elector in constructing the Confession of Faith, which he had just sent to the Emperor. Propriety and consistency would quickly unite in bespeaking the use of these documents in preparing Articles of Faith for public recital and presentation to the Emperor. As Melanchthon tells us that he assumed nothing to himself,* there can be no reasonable doubt that he took "Articles of Faith" into the "Apology" only after consultation with the Elector and his counsellors. It may be that these ordered the introduction of such articles, "in order that false accusations might be refuted." In all probability it was not decided to include Articles of Faith in the Apology until after the reception of Dolzig's report from Innsbruck of May 8th, which was in the hands of the Elector May 10th. From this report it was learned for certain that the Emperor would come to Augsburg and would at once give attention to the subject of religion, though only a short time could be devoted to such matters at the Diet.† This report would at once be considered at Court, and would lead to the prompt adoption of measures to meet the exigency. It was resolved to send the Apology to Luther, and this was done on the eleventh. It would have been an easy matter for Melanchthon, after counseling with his superiors, or after having received their order, to sketch Articles of Faith, such as those must have been which appeared in that first draft

* Preface to *Corpus Doctrinae,* Latin.

† Knaake, *Luther's Antheil,* p. 59. Förstemann, *Urkundenbuch,* I., 177 *et seqq.* It was this report that called forth the following from Melanchthon to Luther, May 11th: "Our Apology is sent to you, although more properly is it a Confession. For the Emperor has not time to hear prolix discussions. Nevertheless I have said those things which I thought would be specially profitable and proper. With this design I have included almost all the Articles of Faith, because Eck has published against us the most diabolical slanders. Against these I wished to oppose a remedy." C. R. II., 45.

(scarcely more than fifteen hundred words), and to be ready with the same in time to meet the chronological conditions required by his and the Elector's letter to Luther, May 11th. The brevity of the Apology *verius* Confession is based on the fact, just learned, that the Emperor would have no time to hear prolix discussions. Yet it "included almost all the Articles of Faith," though not more than seventeen or eighteen, all told, and these bearing the marks of haste in composition. To furnish these Articles of Faith, Melanchthon would need only to rearrange and to condense the Elector's Articles of Faith, that had been sent to the Emperor, a copy of which had doubtless been kept by the Elector, and it is a fact that Melanchthon omitted from the Schwabach Articles the very articles that had been omitted by the Elector, namely, the fifteenth and the sixteenth; and the brevity of Melanchthon's articles was determined by the information given in Dolzig's report.

We may therefore fairly conclude, though we cannot prove absolutely, that the *articuli fidei* were introduced into the Apology May 10th or 11th. The facts, especially Melanchthon's letter, seem scarcely to warrant the assumption of an earlier date. But we know certainly that they were introduced as a *remedium* against Eck's calumniations, and that they are based on the Marburg and more especially on the Schwabach Articles, and that the purpose originated at Augsburg, but whether with Melanchthon or with the Electoral counsellors, remains unknown.

2. *The Relation of the Marburg and Schwabach Articles to the Augsburg Confession.*

Until recently there were writers, both in Germany and in America, who tried to make it appear that Luther was the *author* of the Augsburg Confession, and that Melanchthon was its *composer*—that Luther's pen furnished all the matter for it and that Melanchthon's pen gave it form and style. But modern historical criticism has placed the question of the authorship of the immortal *Augustana* in a clear and unquestionable light. It has excluded Luther entirely from participation in the composition of the Torgau Articles, except that he may have made suggestions. It has also shown that he had nothing to do with the inclusion of Articles of Faith in the Apology, and nothing to do in any way with the composition of at least five very important Articles of Faith embraced in the Confes-

sion; while textual criticism has shown with great accuracy just how much material passed from the Marburg and the Schwabach Articles into the first seventeen articles of the *Augustana*.

Here we refer especially to the labors of Dr. Calinich* and Dr. Knaake,† who, by comparing article with article and word with word, have forever settled the question, for all impartial inquirers, of the relation of the Marburg and Schwabach Articles to the Doctrinal Articles of the Confession.

Dr. Calinich, of Dresden, constructed the following parallel:

Augustana.		*Schwabach Articles.*
Article 1	corresponds to Article	1
" 2	" "	4
" 3	" "	2 and 3
" 4	" "	5
" 5	" "	7 and 8
" 6	" "	6
" 7, 8, 14	" "	12
" 9	" "	9
" 10	" "	10
" 11	" "	11
" 12	lacking in the Schwabach Articles.	
" 13	corresponds to Article	8
" 14	implied in "	12
" 15	corresponds to "	17
" 16	" "	14
" 17	" "	13

The author then calls attention to the fact that the four last Articles of Part I. of the Confession, namely, 18, 19, 20, 21, have no antecedents in the Schwabach series; that the former follows the order of the latter only in Articles: 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11; that in the former, fifteen articles of the latter have found recognition: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17; that five Articles of the former, namely: 12, of Repentance; 18, of Free-will; 19, of the Cause of Sin; 20, of Good Works, and 21, of the Worship of Saints, are not found in the Schwabach series; that in the composition there have been expansions and elaborations: Article III. of the Augsburg Confession embraces 2 and 3 of the Schwabach series; Article V. of the Confession, embraces Articles 7 and 8 of the Schwabach series; while, on the contrary, Article 12 of the Schwabach series unites Articles 7, 8, and 14 of the Confession.

* *Luther und die Augsburgische Confession*, 1861.
† *Luther's Antheil an der Augsb. Conf.*, 1863.

It will thus be seen that Melanchthon made absolutely no use of Articles XV. and XVI. of the Schwabach series in the composition of the Augsburg Confession, and that there are five articles of the Confession that are entirely independent of the Schwabach series. Calinich has also examined in detail each of the first seventeen Doctrinal Articles of the Confession in connection with the corresponding article of the Schwabach series, and has shown the points of agreement and the points of difference. But we cannot transfer his work to these pages. Suffice it to say that he has shown how *little,* rather than how much, was transferred from the two *older* series of Articles to the *Augustana.* He gives the result of his comparison as follows:

"1. The Schwabach Articles were taken as the foundation of Part I. of the Augsburg Confession, Articles 12, 18, 19, 20, 21 excepted.

"2. In the re-writing changes were made, which in part have reference to the order of the separate articles, and in part consist of abbreviations and expansions.

"3. The changes introduced are to be explained by reference to the different purpose of the rewriting, and are unessential in their nature. In a word, we nowhere meet with a doctrine which stands at all in contradiction to the fundamental principles laid down by Luther in the Schwabach Articles."*

Dr. Knaake made a much more minute verbal comparison than was made by Dr. Calinich, but we cannot transfer it to our pages, chiefly because of the difference between the German and the English languages. He, too, confines his comparison to the first seventeen Articles of the Confession, and declares that Luther's participation in the composition of the Confession does not extend beyond those Articles. According to his showing there are no antecedents for Articles VIII. and XIV. of the Confession; only a few words passed from the Marburg and Schwabach Articles to Articles I., II., III., VI., XI., XII., of the Confession; the damnatory clauses, and all that appeals to the teaching of the early Church and of the Fathers, Article I. excepted, appear for the first time in the Confession; Articles IX. and X. are much shorter than the corresponding articles in the Schwabach series; that by actual enumeration in the German, if we have not miscounted, only 438 words passed from the Marburg and the Schwabach series into the first seventeen of the Confession, which in these articles contains about 1600

* Pp. 25-26.

words as given in Tschackert's *Die Unveränderte Augsburgische Konfession,* that is, considerably more than two-thirds of the words of these seventeen articles are the words chosen by Melanchthon, though it is not to be concluded from this numerical difference in the words used, that the influence either of Luther or of Melanchthon on the Confession can be mathematically determined. Yet such an enumeration shows to a demonstration that Melanchthon used his materials in an entirely independent way, so that they formed the *basis,* and only the *basis,* of this first part of the Confession, so that we may conclude that the foundation of Part I., of the Augsburg Confession, is the work of Luther, but that the superstructure is the work of Melanchthon, and whatever superiority—and who can estimate its greatness?—the Augsburg Confession has over the Schwabach Articles, is due to Melanchthon, and the superiority is not only that of form and style. It enters into the contents, and is especially prominent in the adaptation of the contents of the older articles to new needs and to new conditions. Hence we agree substantially with Dr. Knaake, who says: "In regard to the contents, it is to be remarked that nearly all the Articles of the antecedents are worked up into the Confession, though it is not to be denied that there are differences. But this can be satisfactorily explained by reference to the difference in occasion and in purpose. So, especially the additions and the omissions in the Augsburg Confession. For example: That in most of its articles there is added a repudiation of heresies, whereas only a few are mentioned in the Schwabach Articles, cannot surprise us, since the evangelicals at Augsburg wished to present their agreement with the common Christian Church, rather than to fortify their doctrine from the Scripture. In this way is explained the appeal in the Confession to the Church Fathers. But, despite such differences, the relationship of our articles to each other is clearly manifest,"* that is, in the first seventeen, or rather, should we say, in fifteen out of the twenty-one Articles of Faith, since Articles VIII. and XIV. are not derived from the fourteenth Schwabach Article, though they may have been suggested by it. But, inasmuch as the essential thing in Article XIV. is the *rite vocatus,* it may be doubted as to whether even a suggestion in regard to that Article came from anything found in the Schwabach Articles. And, as for Articles: XVIII., Of Free-will; XIX., Of the Cause of Sin; XX., Of Faith and Good

* P. 27.

Works; XXI., Of the Worship of Saints, together with the *Epilogue-Prologue,* in all, in extent of matter nearly one-half of the doctrinal part, and in importance and value equal to any other four articles,—for these four articles it has never been pretended that there are antecedents in the Schwabach Articles, not even by way of suggestion. They are purely of Melanchthonian authorship.

We must conclude, therefore, that the Marburg and the Schwabach Articles, the former wholly from the pen of Luther, the latter in part from his pen, stand as the strong foundation on which fifteen, or, at the utmost, seventeen doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession are based, and furnish not a little of the materials which Melanchthon, the master-builder, wrought into the superstructure of these articles. But he made such changes in the use of the materials thus furnished, by omissions, by additions, by adaptations, by the introduction of new thoughts and by the refinements of style, as cannot be described in words. They can be understood and appreciated only when we compare the Augsburg Confession article by article with its antecedents.

But this relationship must be understood as confined strictly to Part I. of the Confession. The Marburg and the Schwabach Articles had absolutely nothing to do with Part II. of the Confession. That part rests entirely on the Torgau Articles, which, by innumerable omissions, additions and adaptations, were shaped into the Articles on Abuses, which at the time were regarded as constituting the *more important part of the Confession.*

3. *The Author of the Augsburg Confession.*

Who is the author of the Augsburg Confession, in the sense of "one who composes or writes a book; a composer as distinguished from an editor, translator, or compiler"? The facts of history, and the critical comparison of the finished product with the antecedents named, force the conclusion that Philip Melanchthon is the author of the Augsburg Confession exactly in the sense in which we say that William Shakespeare is the author of *Julius Cæsar,* that John Milton is the author of *Paradise Lost,* that Edward Gibbon is author of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* Each of these distinguished authors gathered certain materials together and kept them well in hand. Each arranged his materials in a manner peculiar to himself and adapted them to the end in view, added new thoughts and gave

the whole the impress of his own genius. As a consequence each produced something new, something which did not previously have existence, though not something *absolutely* original in its matter, since absolute originality does not appear in the work of any human author—it is not found in the theology of Luther nor in that of Augustine, nor in that of Paul. Luther's theology is that of Augustine, of St. Bernard, of Peter Lombard, of Thomas Aquinas, of William Occam, with certain eliminations and evangelical additions. He was a great religious genius, but none the less did he adopt and adapt the theological and religious thoughts of other great men who had gleaned in the same field. Melanchthon was not Luther's equal in the sphere of religion, but he was vastly his superior in the realm of theological learning. He could not have written the Small Catechism; neither could Luther have written the Augsburg Confession. Each had his own transcendent gifts and each used his own gifts with transcendent success. As Luther's classic monument is the Small Catechism, so Melanchthon's classic monument is the Augsburg Confession. In the erection of that monument he was not an editor, a translator, a compiler, but an author.

At Augsburg, Melanchthon sought to bring into summary statement the doctrines common to the Evangelical theologians—the doctrines which he had exhibited in the *Loci,* and in the Visitation Articles, and which are found in his own and in Luther's many doctrinal discussions, and in Luther's sermons and postils. It was not his design to originate new doctrines, but avowedly to restate the doctrines of the Catholic Church of Christ. His confessional re-statement of the chief doctrines of Christianity was something as distinctly new in the life and history of the German Reformation as the Declaration of Independence was something new in the life and history of the American people. The Augsburg Confession created an ecclesiastical organization, just as the Declaration of Independence created a political organization. As the latter defined the political rights and principles of the patriots who had fought at Bunker Hill, so the former defined the religious rights and principles of the Lutherans who had protested at Speyer. Each document is something new, and it cannot be denied that the Augsburg Confession, taken as a whole, and as a conception, is vastly different from the Schwabach Articles, vastly different from any creed or confession of faith that had previously existed or that has since come into existence, vastly different from anything that

had been written by Luther, or previously by Melanchthon—something wholly *sui generis,* though Melanchthon had written the Torgau Articles.

But some dogmaticians, or those who have reflected the dogmatic temper, or those who have borrowed the Flacianist calumniations, or those who have superficially examined the facts, have sought to assign Melanchthon a subordinate place in the preparation for and in the composition of the Augsburg Confession. Quite different is the conclusion reached by those Lutheran historians who have taken counsel of the facts, and have allowed to the facts their just weight. Matthes, who wrote a *Life of Melanchthon,* and also an excellent work on *Symbolics,* says: "Perhaps no writing ever gave its author so much solicitude as this, in which every sentence and every word was most carefully pondered."* And Dr. Carl Schmidt, Melanchthon's most learned and impartial biographer, after following the composition of the Augsburg Confession from its beginning to its end, concludes thus: "Such is the Augsburg Confession, which has become so famous in history. Although it was discussed by all the theologians present; although even the civil counsellors and the delegates added their word, and the Saxon Chancellor knew how 'to arrange it before and behind'; yet was it very especially the work of Melanchthon, and belongs to the most important written by him. Everywhere it bears the impress of his spirit. With astonishing clearness and simplicity it presents the doctrine. Scholastic subtlety and terminology are avoided, so that it can be understood by the most unlearned, nor is it susceptible of being misunderstood or falsely interpreted. In vain would you seek a trace of a mind filled with hate or even acting under excitement. The calmness and moderation with which the whole is treated must take from opponents all pretext for complaint of unnecessary violence. All the doctrines are led back in the most logical way to the fundamental principle of justification by faith, and the same principle furnishes the rule by which to judge of ceremonies." †

And Weber, who wrote the most critical and exact history of the Augsburg Confession that has ever been penned, has said: "Now is the time to examine the question, 'Is Melanchthon to be regarded as the author of the Augsburg Confession?' After

* *Symbolik,* p. 56. In the *Life* he says: "Diese Schrift von Melanchthon *ganz allein* verfassten." And again: "From May 11th to June 24th, Luther was not again consulted." Jansen, *Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes,* 17th and 18th Auflage, III., 184-5, *note* 1.

† *Philipp Melanchthon,* p. 207.

what I have already said touching the manner and method by which he prepared the Confession, the question may be regarded as settled. For if he is the author of a writing to whom the matter and the wording belong, or if in a manner peculiar to himself he has worked up the materials found at hand, how can the authorship of the Confession be denied to Melanchthon? Grant that he had before him the materials in the seventeen Schwabach Articles, or, as I have shown above, those of Electoral Saxony, and the essays on religion furnished by the other theologians, did not he elaborate them in an original manner, and from the seed produce the beautiful tree, with its shady branches and fruit? Is La Fontaine or Racine or Corneille to be disparaged, because the first borrowed his materials mostly from other fabulists, and the others from history? Or, to give another illustration: Will anyone dare to say, without blushing, that Mascov, Bunau and Schmidt are not authors, but that they only brought the drafts and materials of history into a particular form? Such is the note which so many theologians and historians of the Augsburg Confession strike since the composition of the Bergic Form of Concord. Men have been at great pains and have invented empty arguments to circumscribe Melanchthon's part in the production of the Augsburg Confession, to depreciate his work, and to reduce it to a clerkship. Melanchthon is not to be regarded as the author of the Augsburg Confession, but is to be regarded as having brought it into a particular form out of the seventeen Articles, which the illustrious man of God, Herr Luther, had previously drawn up? Luther, Jonas and Bugenhagen wrought with Melanchthon on the Confession before he went to Torgau —Luther sent memoranda to Augsburg—Jonas translated the Confession into German (which translation is to be greatly preferred to the original Latin), and gave Melanchthon opportunity still further to change his Latin draft, and to express its contents better—these and similar fancies, borrowed either from a false historical conception, or being absolutely without historical foundation, are the hollow echoes of the anti-Philippistic times, when Luther's zealous disciples envied and disparaged Melanchthon's fame. And I reckon it among the consequences of the Bergic Form of Concord, to which, as to a symbolically binding treatise on the doctrines defined in it, I accord full right, that since that time, it has been the fashion to belittle and to disparage the merit of Melanchthon." *

* *Kritische Geschichte,* I., 47, 48.

None the less clear and distinct is Planck, whose profound researches and independence of judgment give authority to his opinions. He says: "By May 11th, Melanchthon had finished a complete draft. This was sent by the Elector on that date to Coburg. But that draft was changed so much from time to time, up almost to the moment of delivery, by additions and omissions, by elaboration and by the introduction of entirely new articles, that a wholly different work arose, to which, however, the Torgau Articles furnished the foundation. It may be that Melanchthon was led to some of these changes and additions by the drafts brought to Augsburg by the theologians of the other Protestant Estates. Yet he did not make so much use of them that it can be said that he only compiled the Confession out of these different essays. It is also true that the judgment of the other theologians was passed upon each finished part of the work (see Camerarius, *Vita Mel.*, ed. Strobel, p. 120), but it would be not only wrong, but foolish, to say that the finished Confession is not his work, but the joint work of those theologians. Yet such foolishness has been indulged in by the man's enemies." *

Schöpf writes: "The Modest Melanchthon counseled with the other theologians who were present at Augsburg, and with Luther, who had remained at Coburg, yet he was especially the author, and only he, with his gentleness, was qualified for the work." †

Times almost without number does Melanchthon speak of himself as the author of the Augsburg Confession, and no one ever disputed the correctness of his representation so long as he lived. And his friend and biographer, Camerarius, writing of the composition of the Confession, says: "After the most careful deliberation a writing was composed by the labor, study, care and immense toil of Melanchthon, which contains in several chapters a statement and explanation of all the doctrine. . . . When the entire burden was placed upon him and was borne by him, it was accomplished with the most laudable care, so that nothing might be done to wound his own conscience before God, or to injure his esteem before men, or to seem to bring destruction to the state." ‡

John Brentz wrote at Augsburg, June 24, 1530: "We have drawn up an epitome of our doctrine, *Philip Melanchthon* being

* *Geschichte der Prot. Theol.*, 3. p. 41, *note.*
† *Die Symb. Bücher*, p. 26.
‡ *Vita Philippi Melanchthonis*, Ed. Strobel, pp. 120, 121.

its author.''* And those who buried Melanchthon inscribed on the lid of his coffin: AUTOR CONFESSIONIS AUGUSTANAE.

But when Melanchthon and his Augsburg associates had passed away, and a generation of passionate zealots had come into place, who were more intent upon urging their own interpretation of the Confession, than upon ascertaining its history, it became the fashion in places to disparage Melanchthon in the Church which he had helped to create, and to name Luther the author of the matter and the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, and to call Melanchthon the author of its *form,* of its *rhetoric,* of its *style.* That is, the profound scholar, the accomplished writer, the learned theologian, the trusted counsellor of Princes did the work of an amanuensis at Augsburg! The πρώτων ψεύδος once started, it suited the taste and temper of a dogmatic age to keep it moving, though there have always been those who had the manly courage to protest against the great injustice.

Happily, during the last seventy or eighty years, the materials for writing a correct history of the Augsburg Confession have been more and more brought to light. Historical criticism has done its noble work; and we are far enough away from the rivalries and strifes and bitternesses of the sixteenth century to be able to regard the transactions at Augsburg with clearer vision than the Epigoni could employ, since they were compelled to work in the shadow of the men who made the 25th of June, 1530, the birthday of a new era in the Church of Christ on earth.

The discovery of the ''long and rhetorical Preface'' has put to flight forever the figment that the ''Articles of Faith'' constitute the Preface of which Melanchthon writes to Luther on the fourth of May.† And the discovery of Eck's 404 Articles has made it indisputably certain that Articles of Faith were introduced at Augsburg without consultation with Luther, that is, on the motion of Melanchthon himself, or at the command of his superiors; and we have seen the limited extent to which the Schwabach Articles were used in Part I. of the Confession, and as for Part II., that is out and out the work of Melanchthon, though he probably received suggestions from Luther at Wittenberg and at Coburg, *but never afterwards.*

* C. R. II., 124.

† C. R. II., 39.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DELIVERY OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

Early on the morning of June 15th, the Princes assembled at the *Rathaus* in Augsburg to arrange for the reception of the Emperor. They spent several hours in disputing over questions of rank and precedence. Then, at two o'clock, they proceeded to the Lecha to meet the Emperor, and to escort him into the city, which he entered between eight and nine o'clock P. M., and then proceeded to the episcopal palace, which had been made ready for his reception. Here he detained the Protestant Princes for about two hours, haranguing them for having allowed their preachers to preach, and commanding them to join the *Corpus Christi* procession the next day. The excitement was so great that some of the Protestants were called out of bed and informed of what was going on.*

1. *Preliminary Movements.*

The next morning, at seven o'clock, the Protestant Princes (the Elector of Saxony excepted, who was indisposed as a consequence of the late detention by the Emperor the previous evening) appeared before the Emperor and gave reasons why they could not interdict preaching, nor enter the procession. Here they were detained until ten o'clock.† Then they visited the indisposed Elector, and there resolved to make reply in writing to the requisitions of the Emperor. Chancellor Brück then wrote a long opinion, giving reasons why the evangelical Princes could not interdict preaching; and the Saxon theologians prepared a *Bedenken* on the question "Whether the Elector and other Protestant Princes can take part in the procession of *Corpus Christi* day without doing violence to consciences." ‡

On the morning of June 17th, the Princes presented to the Emperor their reason for refusing to interdict preaching. And

* See Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., p. 263; Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, 54, 57, 59. C. R. II., 106.

† Schirrmacher, *ut supra*, pp. 61, 482. C. R. II., 111.

‡ See these papers in Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 283 *et seqq.*; Schirrmacher, p. 64. C. R. II., p. 110.

that day Adam Weiss preached before the Elector, and John Rurer, under instruction from Margrave George, preached in the Church of Saint Catharine.* In the afternoon of this day Melanchthon had a conference with the imperial secretaries, Schlepper and Valdesius. Here he declared that the difference between the Protestants and the Catholics had reference chiefly to Priestly Celibacy, to Private Mass and to the Communion in both kinds.†

In the forenoon of the eighteenth the Protestants assembled at the *Rathaus* to hear the imperial decision in regard to the discontinuance of preaching. They made reply, and at first refused obedience to the imperial mandate. Finally it was arranged that preaching should be discontinued on both sides,‡ and yet Adam Weiss preached on that day before the Elector. Melanchthon had another interview with Valdesius. Here it was proposed to settle the dissension without having the Confession read. Melanchthon promised to consider the matter.§ In the evening the imperial interdict of preaching was proclaimed.

We thus see that the three days immediately following the Emperor's entrance into the city were occupied almost exclusively with the matter of the Protestant preaching. Hence Melanchthon could write: "This matter was in dispute three days"—"This matter was then in dispute three days"—"At once he (the Emperor) forbade ours to preach. As they did not immediately obey, the dispute lasted three days." || During these three days the theologians were mostly engaged in preparing *Bedenken* on various questions, in preaching and in holding interviews, and so active were they with their pens that he who looks at the documents prepared by them during these three days, as they are given by Förstemann and Schirrmacher, simply wonders how so much could have been done and written in so short a time. And yet the Confession had almost dropped out of consideration, for not once in all these documents, including two letters written by the Nürnberg commissioners June 16th, do we find a word about the Confession. Indeed, we know that work on the Confession was suspended, and that it was in danger of being abandoned.¶

* Schirrmacher, p. 484; Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch,* I., p. 268; Müller, p. 545; Pfeilschmidt, p. 55.

† Schmidt, *Philipp Melanchthon,* p. 195. C. R. II., p. 122.

‡ Schirrmacher, p. 58 *et seqq.;* Pfeilschmidt, p. 55.

§ Schmidt, p. 196.

|| C. R. II., pp. 117, 118; Bindseil's *Supplementa Melanchthonis,* p. 61.

¶ Schmidt, p. 196; C. R. XXVI., 209, 210; C. R. II., 112; *Realencycl.,*[3] p. 249.

The next day, June 19th, which was Sunday, the Nürnberg commissioners, in a letter to their Senate, say that the Epilogue to the Confession has not yet been prepared, and that Melanchthon is contemplating a briefer statement.* On this day Melanchthon wrote several letters, and Brentz a long one to Isenmann, and yet neither of them speaks of any work having been recently done on the Confession.

2. *Opening of the Diet.*

We now come to Monday, June 20th. At seven o'clock in the morning the Elector and other Princes went to the palace and attended the Emperor to the Cathedral, where Mass was held "prior to the opening of the imperial proposition." The Elector, as Arch-Marshal of the Empire, carried the sword before the Emperor, and with other Princes, both Catholic and Protestant, sat with him in the choir of the church on the right side, sixteen in all.† The Mass was celebrated by the Archbishop of Mayence. This was followed by a long oration in Latin, delivered by the Papal Nuncio, Vincentius Pimpinelli, Bishop of Rossin.‡ Then the Offertorium was sung and the *Da Pacem* was kissed, the Elector of Saxony bearing the sword.§ The services of worship being now ended, the Emperor, attended by the Princes and orders of the Empire, the Elector of Saxony bearing a drawn sword, went to the *Rathaus.* Here now the Diet was formally opened and the Imperial Proposition was read.|| The first point had reference to the Turkish War, and does not concern us in this narrative. The second discusses the affairs of religion as they exist "in some parts of Germany." It recites how the Emperor, "as the supreme advocate, and the watchful and earnest defender of the orthodox faith, of the Christian religion and of the Catholic Church, in order that he might apply the remedy in time, had summoned the Diet of Worms," had instituted measures for quieting the distractions and reconciling animosities. But the Decree had not been obeyed. As a consequence, the way was opened for the entrance of many

* C. R. II., 112.

† See Coelestin I., 103, 104, and J. J. Müller, p. 560, where names and circumstances are given.

‡ See what purports to be Pimpinelli's Oration, in Coelestin, I., pp. 105-115.

§ During the Mass in the church the sword was borne by Joachim von Pappenheim, hereditary Marshal of the Empire. See Coelestin, I., 115*b*, and J. J. Müller, p. 562.

|| Coelestin, I., 115*b*; J. J. Müller, p. 563.

evils and distresses and of diverse and opposing views in the Church. That he might gain a proper knowledge of the situation and might remove the schism and pacify the minds of men, he had made a long and dangerous journey. He entertains the hope that by his presence peace and concord will be restored. He therefore "requests the Electors, Princes and all the Estates of the Empire to present, written in Latin and in German, their opinions and views, in order that, according to the letter of convocation, the affair might be the more profitably and the more speedily understood and brought to an end."

When the reading of the Proposition was finished the Electors and Princes rose to their feet, and after some deliberation first made reply, and then thanked the Emperor for his presence at the Diet. They were then commanded to send their secretaries to the *Rathaus* at three o'clock P. M., to obtain each a copy of the Imperial Proposition. The Emperor now rose up and was conducted to the palace by the Princes. It was one o'clock P. M.

The following account of the opening of the Diet is given by Kress and Volkamer, the Nürnberg commissioners, who were present: "Since our last letter (June 19th) nothing further has been done, for on Sunday the Emperor went to the Cathedral to the Sacrament, and yesterday, Monday, the Mass of the Holy Ghost was sung at the Cathedral in the presence of all the Estates. Especially were the Elector of Saxony, Margrave George, also Hessen and Lüneburg present, and they attended the Emperor in all the ceremonies. During the service the Apostolic Nuncio, in behalf of the Pope, from a lofty platform erected before the High Altar, delivered to the Emperor and to the Imperial Estates a Latin oration more than an hour long, and admonished them most earnestly to resist the Turk, and to put an end to the schism of the faith, and to settle other matters in the Empire.

"Then the Emperor, the King, and all the Electors, Princes and Estates adjourned to the *Rathaus,* where *Duke Frederick,* in behalf of the Emperor, made a short address, and opened the Diet, and read the Programme according to which the Emperor would conduct the affairs of the Diet. Thereupon the Electors and Princes, through Margrave *Joachim,* delivered in reply an address expressive of loyalty and obedience. It was decided to give a copy of the Emperor's Programme to the Electors, Princes and Estates, that they might consider it, and afterwards come together and consult. After this the Emperor and all the Estates, at one o'clock—so long had the session lasted—left the house." *

* C. R. II., 121-2. For fuller and more minute accounts of the opening

3. *Agreement to Present a Confession in Common.*

The Appeal sent from Speyer has brought an answer. An Imperial Diet takes the place of a national council. The Protestant Princes are now ordered to present, in writing, their views about the religious conditions in Germany. The hour for which they had long prayed and pleaded has come. But only in part are the Protestants prepared to meet the exigencies of that hour. The Elector of Saxony has his Articles of Faith, and his Articles on the Abuses which had been corrected, written both in Latin and in German. Other Protestant Princes had come to Augsburg with *Bedenken.* Concert of action had not been consummated, though the subject had elicited attention and had incited to some action. Already, in Melanchthon's letter of May 22d, to Luther, an intimation is given that the Landgrave of Hesse might subscribe the Saxon Articles, but the fact that the Landgrave showed strong sympathy with the Zwinglians and the Strassburgers placed difficulties in the way of united action.* Even the Elector of Saxony treated the first suggestion of united action with rebuke, thinking that it might be of the devil.† But the matter is pressed by the Nürnberg commissioners, and finds ready response from the chancellor of Margrave George, who thought that it would be well for those who are at one in the articles of faith to present a common statement in the name of all the Princes and cities, and to follow the Margrave and the Elector. So far had the suggestion proceeded by June 8th.‡

of the Diet, see Schirrmacher, *Briefe und Acten,* 73-5; Coelestin, *Historia,* I., 103 *et seqq.;* Chytraeus, *Historia,* p. 52. For the Imperial Program in German, see Schirrmacher, pp. 79-81; J. J. Müller, *Historie,* pp. 564 *et seqq.;* Förstemann, *Urkundenbuch,* I., 306 *et seqq.* For the same in Latin, called *Propositio,* see Coelestin, *Historia,* I., 120-1; Chytraeus, *Historia,* pp. 53-60.

* For political, as well as for theological, reasons the Lutherans assembled at Augsburg were intensely hostile to the views of the Zwinglians. Agricola preached again and again at Augsburg against the Zwinglian view of the Lord's Supper, and called the Zwinglians *Geschriftstürmer.* Michael Keller defended the Zwinglian view. The people of Augsburg strongly favored the Zwinglian preachers, and felt indignation against their assailants. Philip of Hesse, up to June 12th, had not attended the Lutheran preaching. See Jonas, *Briefwechsel* (Kawerau), I., 151-2; also, *Politische Correspondenz der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter der Reformation,* 446 *et seqq.* Melanchthon and Brentz labored to turn the Landgrave from his Zwinglian sympathies. See the correspondence, C. R. II., 92-103. They even invoked the aid of Luther. See Knaake's *Luther's Antheil;* Köstlin, *Martin Luther,* II., 216, 654; Schirrmacher, *Briefe und Acten,* p. 489. There can be no doubt that Eck's 404 Articles had quickened the zeal of the Lutherans against the Zwinglians. Nor had Melanchthon recovered from the opposition which he had conceived against the alliance with the cities of Southern Germany, which was to have been consummated at Rotach (see p. 18).

† C. R. II., 53.

‡ C. R. II., 88.

Melanchthon has also caught the spirit of this movement, and for certain words, which have exclusive reference to the Elector, he has substituted common words which refer to all the Estates, and has expressed the thought that the "Preface and the Conclusion may be set forth, not alone in the name of the Elector, but, in common, in the name of all the united Lutheran Princes and Estates." Yet nothing had been said to the Margrave, nor to the Nürnberg commissioners. But the latter are persistent and write to their Senate: "We think it would be well to speak with Margrave George, and then, in his name and in yours, to make a suggestion to the Elector. We offer this for your further consideration, and await your decision, especially as to whether we shall present a Preface and a Conclusion according to your conception, or shall request a Confession in common words, in the name of all the Princes and Estates, and shall send the same to you for further revision." *

We are now brought to Wednesday, June 15th, the day on which the Emperor entered Augsburg, with the proposition of concerted action, practically confined to the Margrave and to the Nürnbergers. At least, we do not hear that the proposition is seriously entertained by the other Protestant Princes and Estates.†

The next five days were occupied with matters that seemed to divert attention from the Confession. At least, we do not hear it mentioned in the circles of the Princes and Estates. But now that the Emperor's Programme has demanded that they present their views on the subject of religion in writing, it is easy to see that the importance of united action and of a common confession of their faith would not long remain absent from their thoughts. What seems so proper and natural to us, at so great a distance, seemed just as proper and natural to them in the thick of the danger. For already, on the evening of the 20th, "Duke John the Elector assembled his allies in religion at his lodgings, and exhorted them in an earnest and solemn address, faithfully and fearlessly to stand by and to defend the cause of God and the pure religion, and not to allow themselves, by any threats or intimidations to be led to deny the same, since all machinations against God will be impotent, and the good cause will at length undoubtedly triumph." ‡ This he did in view of

* C. R. II., 105.
† See letter of Nürnberg Commissioners, C. R. II., 112.
‡ Coelestin, *Historia*, I., 121-2.

the fact that the Emperor had ordered both him and his co-religionists to present themselves at the *Rathaus,* on Wednesday, 22d.* But more important still were the transactions of the next day.

Coelestin has given the following account: "On the twenty-first day of the same month, the Elector of Saxony, having sent all his counsellors and attendants from his presence, alone in secret, read the Psalter, and most fervently prayed God for the glory of his name and for the salvation of many souls, to assist, to promote, to advance, and to defend the cause of true religion.

"He also wrote down his good pious reflections. These were given by John Dolsch, the Electoral Counsellor, to Melanchthon, who read them with admiration and retained them. The Elector's autograph was subsequently exhibited by Dolsch at Leipzig to many learned and honorable men, who read it.

"The same day, about 8 o'clock A. M., he carefully, alone, examined and pondered the Proposition which at the opening of the Diet had been read by order of the Emperor to all the Orders and Estates of the Empire. A little later, when about to take refreshments, he called his son, John Frederick, Philip Melanchthon and Dr. Pontanus, and conferred with them very confidentially about religion, and made known his plans, distinctly affirming that he would neither confer nor act in political matters, except the cause of religion be first taken up for decision and determination, and yet he would make no pronunciamento without the advice of his allies in religion. Therefore, at 2 o'clock P. M., he summons to his quarters the Estates kindred in religion. When all these had assembled at the appointed time, Duke John, the Elector, ordered Dr. Pontanus to read the Proposition to all the Evangelical Orders present, with a loud and distinct utterance, so that each one could hear, understand and ponder it, and could declare openly and make known his opinion concerning it. When the Proposition had been read, the Evangelical Estates say that they are diligently considering the whole subject, and that they wish to meet the Prince the next day and to counsel with him." †

We have another account of this meeting of the Evangelical Princes and Estates. On the afternoon of that same day, June 21st, the Nürnberg commissioners wrote a letter to their Senate, finishing it at five o'clock. Referring, doubtless, to the matter

* J. J. Müller, *Historie,* p. 56.
† Coelestin, *Historia,* p. 122; Müller, *Historie,* p. 568.

of a common confession, they say: "Since our last letter (June 19th) nothing further has been done." Then they add a "Postscript," written the same evening, and say: "After we had finished this letter, I, Kress, was summoned to the Elector's quarters. His Electoral Grace, Margrave George, and the counsellors of Hesse and Lüneburg were there. They declare simply that, inasmuch as the Elector has already had a confession of faith composed, a copy of which you have received, they have presented themselves before the Elector and Margrave George for the purpose of joining the Elector. They are holding a session over those articles for the purpose of further revising, composing and finishing them. It is the desire of the Princes that your Excellencies should immediately send your preachers, or whom you will, but especially Osiander, and would instruct them to help us to consider and to deliberate over these articles and whatever else is needed in the transaction." *

This "Postscript" supplements and confirms the account given by Coelestin, since both accounts recite the transactions of the same persons, viz., the Elector and other Evangelical Princes, on the same afternoon, viz., that of Tuesday, June 21st, and at the same place, viz., at the lodgings of the Elector of Saxony. Kress, the Nürnberg commissioner, was present at this meeting and reports the consummation of the Nürnberg-Margrave plan for a common confession and for united action. On this Tuesday afternoon the *Saxon* Confession begins its larger mission. It now becomes the bond of union for the Evangelical "party," and then the fundamental confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. To serve this larger purpose, it had to be *revised, adapted* and brought to a close. Hence it is not until Tuesday afternoon that we have what may be called the *relatively finished* Augsburg Confession, though Melanchthon, so the historians are careful to inform us, continued to make changes in it up to the last hour before its delivery to the Emperor. Certainly, this day witnessed a glorious consummation. It deserves to be celebrated as one of the memorable days in the history of Lutheranism; for, had the Evangelical Princes gone before the Diet, each with his own confession, the result would have been inextricable confusion. Each would have defended his own, and doubtless would have done so at the expense of his co-religionists. But a common danger, and the consciousness of being at one in faith, and the common obligation to obey the imperial requisition, brought

* C. R. II., p. 124.

them to see the wisdom and the desirability of having and of presenting one and the same confession. The Nürnberg Senate and their commissioners at Augsburg, and the Chancellor of the Margrave deserve high praise for the wisdom, the statesmanship, and the perseverance shown by them in regard to this the most important proposition that had yet come before the Protestant Estates. Union at this time meant strength and the ability to withstand opposition. Isolation would have stood as a synonym for weakness, and would have invited defeat. Magnanimous was the Elector in having invited the other Estates to unite with him in a common response to the imperial proposition, and equally magnanimous were they in accepting his confession as theirs.

4. *The Confession is Finished and Signed.*

Coelestin, after reciting what was done by the Elector and Princes, June 21st, continues right on as follows: "When, therefore, on the following day the Protestants came together, it was unanimously agreed, after deliberation, that no action should be taken touching political matters until religion and the Christian faith had been treated and decided upon, and that they would not assent to the demands of the Emperor to continue aid against the Turks until they had treated of, and reached a decision in regard to the articles of faith and the peace of the Christian Church." Coelestin then recites the Response made by the Princes to the Imperial Proposition, in which Response the declaration is made that attention must first be given in the Diet to the affairs of religion, and tells us that when the Emperor had been informed of the action of the Princes, he commanded that they should present to him, in writing, sealed, the confession and summary of their faith and a statement of the methods by which the abuses in the Church might be corrected and removed. From other sources of information we know that this presentation was ordered to be made on the following Friday.* Hence the action of the Evangelicals on the next day as reported by Coelestin:

"On the Vigil of John the Baptist, Thursday, June 23d, at the request of the Elector of Saxony, the Articles of the Confession were read in a large assemblage of the Evangelical Orders, with the purpose and intention especially, that if anyone thought that anything in them ought to be changed, he might speak freely and candidly and might so declare. When the reading was ended,

* J. J. Müller, *Historie*, p. 571.

and they (the Articles of the Confession) were approved by all, it was decided to ask the Emperor the next day, that with his consent, they might be recited in the hearing of all the orders of the Empire." *

A more minute account of this same transaction is given by the Nürnberg commissioners, who were present at and took part in this meeting on Thursday, June 23d. Early on Saturday, June 25th, they wrote a letter to their Senate. After reciting that on Wednesday the Evangelical Estates had decided to demand that the subject of religion should be allowed to take precedence of everything else, they report as follows: "Last Thursday morning we and the legate from Reutlingen were summoned into the presence of the Saxon, the Hessian, Margrave George, and Lüneburg. There, in the presence of their Princely Graces, counsellors and theologians—there were twelve theologians, besides other scholars and doctors—the afore-mentioned Confession of Faith was read, examined and considered, so that it could be read yesterday afternoon to the Emperor in the presence of the Estates of the Empire. Then, because the copying and the composition of the Preface and of the Conclusion consumed considerable time, the Elector and Princes, through their counsellors, besought the Emperor for an extension of time. But this was denied them, and yesterday, at three o'clock in the afternoon, the Emperor and all the Estates came to the House," † that is, to the *Rathaus,* as we know from other accounts that this second session of the Diet was held at that place.

5. *The Confession is Read and Delivered.*

The Diet assembled at the *Rathaus* about three o'clock P. M. on Friday. In a long oration, delivered in Latin, Cardinal Campeggius, pontifical legate *a latere,* exhorted the Princes to join the Emperor in exterminating heresy and in reconciling the minds of men, and in removing the dissensions, so that all might together carry on war successfully against the Turk and all infidels. This was followed by orations from the commissioners of Lower Austria, who had been sent to the Diet to implore aid against the Turk, who was spreading desolation in that part of the Empire.

The hearing of those speeches and the delivery of suitable

* Coelestin, *Historia,* I., 123*b*; J. J. Müller, *Historie,* p. 569; Brück, *Geschichte,* pp. 49, 50.
† C. R. II., 127.

responses occupied a very large part of the session. But when all this was over, the Elector of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Dukes of Lüneburg, the Landgrave of Hesse, and the Prince of Anhalt rose up together, and standing near the imperial throne, addressed the Emperor through Dr. Gregory Brück, the Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony: They say that they knew and daily have observed that many things pertaining to the articles of their faith, and to the ceremonies that are practiced in their churches have been misrepresented to his Imperial Majesty, as that they have introduced new and unscriptural doctrines, heresies, schisms and other monstrous and absurd opinions, and scatter and disseminate the same among the people. They most humbly entreat the Imperial Majesty, the Electors and Princes patiently to hear and to understand the sum of the doctrine which is preached in their several dominions, since the matter pertains not only to their reputation, fortunes, blood and life, but to the welfare and eternal salvation of their souls.

Then, after some consultation with King Ferdinand and the Catholic Princes, the Emperor signified through the Elector Frederick that, as evening was now at hand, and as the Confession of the Protestants was in writing, it was his gracious pleasure that it be delivered to him. He, with his counsellors, would take it into consideration and return an answer. But this did not suit the Protestants. They insisted, through Chancellor Brück, that the Emperor should hear their Confession read. The Emperor consulted with his advisers and again refused the request of the Protestants. The Protestants now "vehemently insist, and most humbly and for God's sake beg that their Confession should be read before all, as the exigency was very great, and no one was wantonly attacked in it. Whereupon the Emperor a third time had it announced that he was not inclined to grant their request. But as it was now late, it was his Majesty's desire that the Elector and Princes should present their Confession, and that to-day, at two o'clock P. M., he would consider it at the palace in the presence of the Electors, the Princes and Estates.

"But the Elector and Princes again declare that they desire nothing so much as that the Confession be read before his Majesty and the Estates, and most earnestly pray this. But if it could not at this time be read to his Majesty, then it is their desire that his Majesty, instead of hearing it at the palace, as he had offered, should about that time appear again at the *Rathaus*

and allow the Confession to be read, and should leave it in their hands, that they might revise and correct it, inasmuch as they had been hastened. The Emperor persisted that the hearing should take place at the palace, and consented that the Confession should remain in the hands of the Elector and the Princes until that hour. This the Princes had to accept. Consequently the Confession is to be read to-day."

Such is the account given by the Nürnberg commissioners, eyewitnesses, of the efforts made by the Protestant Princes, on the afternoon of June 24th, to have their Confession read, and of the Emperor's persistent refusal to hear it, at least in the large assembly. The Protestants were impelled by the exigency that forced them to introduce articles of faith into their Apology. They meant to counteract the effect of Eck's slanders on the mind of the Emperor and of the Catholic Princes. This is clearly stated in Brück's address to the throne. They wanted the Emperor and the Catholic Estates to hear their defense read in the most public place and before the largest audience. As Eck's articles had been delivered to the Emperor and to the public in print, it was but just that the refutation should be delivered in the most public and formal manner. That the Emperor, under advice of his counsellors, refused to hear the Confession read, is doubtless due to an apprehension that the public reading of the Confession would create sympathy for the Protestant cause, and would give a wider circulation to the Protestant doctrines.

The result of the persistence on both sides was a compromise. The Emperor agreed to hear the Confession read. The Protestants agreed to read it in the palace, but meanwhile they keep it in their hands for revision and correction.

It was in this interval that the Confession was brought to its final form. For some days the Protestant theologians, and especially Melanchthon, had been working day and night on it in order to give it the best possible shaping for its high destination.* To what extent it is changed in these later days of its composition we do not know. But the Nürnberg legates say: "The Confession, in so far as the articles of faith are concerned, is in substance almost in accord with that which we have already sent you; but in some parts it is improved, and everywhere it is made as mild as possible, though, in our judgment, nothing neces-

* Salig, *Historie,* I., 195; J. J. Müller, *Historie,* p. 571.

sary has been omitted. Hence we have agreed to all this, and in your name have joined the Princes and Reutlingen." *

June 25th comes apace. The Protestant Confession has received the last refining touch from the hand of its author. It is now ready to be read and to be delivered to the most invincible Emperor Charles V., Cæsar Augustus, at a Diet of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. At three o'clock P. M. King Ferdinand and the Elector and Princes, together with the legates who had signed the Protestant Confession, repaired to the Episcopal Palace and were shown into the chapel, where the Emperor was accustomed to hold his devotions. The room could hold comfortably about two hundred persons. The multitude of those who stood without was very great. But the Emperor forbade admission to all except the Princes and their counsellors and the commissioners of the imperial cities. The others, to whom admission was refused, remained in the court below and heard as best they could. At one end of the little room, on a raised platform, sat Charles V., richly clad, under a splendid canopy. On the right he was flanked by the Elector of Saxony, followed by a long line of Princes. On the left sat King Ferdinand under a small canopy, flanked by the Electors of Mayence and Cologne, the empty chair of Treves, by Archbishops and Bishops. In the midst of these sat Dr. John Eck. Towards the rear sat the commissioners of the cities and the civil counsellors. In the middle of the room sat the two imperial secretaries. The supreme moment came at four o'clock, when the Protestant Princes made as though they would rise and stand during the reading of their Confession. But the Emperor bade them sit down. Then Drs. Brück and Beyer came forward in front of the Emperor, the former holding in his hand the Latin copy of the Confession, and the latter the German copy. The Emperor asked that the Latin copy be read, but the Elector of Saxony interposed, and said: "We are on German soil. Therefore I hope his Majesty will also permit the German language." After a short address by Dr. Brück in the name of the Protestant Princes and Estates, the Confession was read by Dr. Beyer in the German language. The reading lasted two hours. The Emperor, the King, Princes and Bishops, and others, listen with

* The letter of the Nürnberg commissioners, from which we have copiously quoted in this section, was written very early in the morning of June 25th. C. R. II., 127-130. See Coelestin, *Historia,* I., 133-4; J. J. Müller, *Historie,* pp. 580 *et seqq.;* Chytraeus, *Historia,* p. 69; Fikenscher, *Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg,* pp. 81 *et seqq.*

the closest attention, though the Emperor is said to have slept for awhile.* When Dr. Beyer read from the Confession (Art. XXIII.) that four hundred years before that time the Pope prohibited marriage to the German priests, and that the Archbishop of Mayence had encountered much opposition in enforcing the edict, the King asked the Archbishop of Mayence if that was true.† After the reading Dr. Brück took both copies and was about to deliver them to Alexander Schweiss, one of the imperial secretaries, to be passed by him to the Elector of Mayence. But the Emperor reached out his hands and took both copies.‡ The German copy he gave to the Elector of Mayence, to be deposited in the imperial archives. The Latin copy he retained by him and subsequently had it placed in the imperial archives at Brussels. Both copies were originals, and both are supposed to have perished, at least it is not known that either is in existence anywhere in the world. Neither did the Protestants keep a certified or official copy of their Confession.

The Emperor commanded his secretary, Alexander Schweiss, to translate the Confession into French and Italian, and to see that not one word was omitted in the translations, but that the whole matter be correctly expressed. Cardinal Campeggius sent a copy of the Italian version to the Pope, Clement VII. The ambassadors of the Kings of England, France and Portugal, and the representatives of other foreign potentates, had the Confession translated into their respective languages, and sent to their Principals.§

"Thus it happened," says J. J. Müller, "that this Confession of Faith, almost like lightning, spread in a moment from the East to the West, and was espoused not only by individuals, but by entire nations—yea, it shall stand not only before the Pope, but before the Devil, and before the gates of hell to the last day."

But this account of the reading and delivery of the Confession, drawn from the most authentic sources, may with profit to the reader be supplemented by reports from those who were eyewitnesses of the transactions of that day, which dates the birth of a great Evangelical Church.

* *C. R.* II., p. 145 and p. 245.
† Coelestin, I., p. 189; Spalatin, *Annales*, p. 139.
‡ Spalatin, p. 139; Brück, *Geschichte*, p. 55. *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1906), p. 738.
§ J. J. Müller, pp. 585 *et seqq.;* Coelestin, I., 141; Salig, I., 210 *et seqq.;* Schirrmacher, p. 93.

The Elector of Saxony, writing to Luther, June 25th, evidently before three o'clock P. M., says: "On the day of John the Baptist (June 24th) we, with our allies, presented ourselves before the Emperor, the King of Bohemia, the Electors and Estates, at a public meeting, and offered, in accordance with the imperial command, to present our Articles in Latin and German, to read publicly and deliver the German. Though we several times humbly begged to read them publicly, yet we did not succeed, for the King and the opposing party resolutely resisted it. But we have the assurance that the Emperor will hear the Articles to-day in the palace—so arranged that not many persons can be present." *

On June 26th the Nürnberg commissioners write to their Senate as follows: "Yesterday, Saturday, at 3 o'clock P. M., the Confession of Faith, as it was when last we wrote you, subscribed by the Elector, the other Princes and, in your name and in that of Reutlingen, was delivered in Latin and German to the Emperor in the presence of the King, the Electors, Princes and Estates, assembled in the palace. It was first read in German before their Majesties, the Electors, Princes and Estates by the Saxon Chancellor, Dr. Christian (Beyer), publicly and distinctly, so that all present could easily hear it. Then the Emperor, after conferring with the other Electors and Princes, announced through Duke Frederick to the Elector of Saxony and his allies, that his Majesty had heard the Confession. But inasmuch as the matter was somewhat lengthy, and also highly important, necessity was laid on his Majesty to consider and to counsel well over the whole matter—that he would do this and would demean himself in the matter as becomes a gracious Christian Emperor, and when he shall have made up his mind on the subject, he will again summon the Elector and the Princes. For this answer and for the gracious hearing the Elector, Princes and allies returned hearty thanks to the Emperor, the King, the Electors, Princes and Estates, with the assurance that they had acted with all loyalty and friendliness; also that if his Majesty should summon them again, they would willingly appear, and not only in regard to this matter, but in regard to all the matters for which

* German in Schirrmacher, pp. 88-9, and in Chytraeus, p. 45*b*; Latin in Coelestin, I., p. 140. Valdesius, in his *History of the Diet of Augsburg*, given by Cyprian, Beylage VII., says that the Lutheran Princes wanted their Confession read publicly for the purpose of catching the popular ear. No doubt each party correctly interpreted the motive of the other. The Protestants were successful in their principal contention, viz., that the Confession should be *read*.

the Diet had been summoned by his Majesty, they would perform their duty.

"Then the Emperor, as has since been reported to us, spoke with the Elector and Princes privately, and requested them to retain the Confession by them, and not to allow it to be printed. This they promised to do. His Majesty did not conduct himself ungraciously during these proceedings. We have also heard more than one say that no objection could be found with such a Confession, and some of the Electors and Princes regard it as moderate." *

In Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, pp. 89, 90, we have the following account: "On Saturday after John the Baptist's day, the Elector of Saxony, Duke John, the Margrave George of Brandenburg, Duke John Frederick of Saxony, Duke Ernest of Brunswick and Lüneburg, Landgrave Philip of Hesse, Duke Francis of Brunswick and Lüneburg, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt, and the two cities, Nürnberg and Reutlingen, had the CONFESSION of their faith and of the entire Christian doctrine that is preached in their principalities, lands and cities, publicly read in German, article by article, with joyous courage and heart, and that not only in the presence of all the Electors, Princes, Estates, Bishops, Counsellors, that were present, but also before the Roman Emperor himself and his brother, King Ferdinand.

"It was read by the Saxon Chancellor, Dr. Christian, so loud and so distinctly that it was heard not only in the hall, but also in the yard below, that is, in the Bishop of Augsburg's court, where the Emperor's lodgings are.

"The Confession had been composed in German and in Latin, but on account of the shortness of the time it was read only in the German. The Estates also promised a fuller explanation in case anything should be found lacking in the Confession, and they declare that they do not decline the council that has been so long promised and ordered." †

6. *The Effect of the Reading of the Confession.*

The effect of the reading of the Confession before the Emperor and Estates, and in the hearing of so many people in the court below, was twofold. In the first place, it strengthened and ratified the bond of union which the Protestants had established

* C. R. II., 142 *et seqq.*

† See an almost verbally identical account of the reading of the Confession in Spalatin's *Annales*, pp. 134-5.

between themselves when they subscribed their common Confession, on June 23d. By compliance with the terms of the Imperial Proposition they had brought their cause orderly and lawfully before the Diet of the Empire, and had obtained the promise from His Imperial Majesty that their cause should be carefully and becomingly considered. They had achieved the object of their presence at Augsburg, not by violence, not by resistance to the civil power, but with all humility and with protestations of loyalty and devotion. They were bold for the honor of God and in defense of truth against calumny and detraction. As a consequence, they were made strong by the great transaction, as men are always made strong when they perform a duty that involves their reputation, their lives, the eternal destiny of their souls.

The second effect was that Eck's "most diabolical slanders" had been refuted. The Confession read showed that the Lutherans did not blaspheme God, nor profane the sacraments, nor disseminate absurd and monstrous opinions; that they were not the allies of the Anabaptists and of all the ancient and modern heretics whom the Church had condemned; that they did not abolish the divine worship, nor rave against the Church worse than the Turks. On the contrary, the Confession showed the Emperor and the Catholic Estates that the Lutherans stood on the Scriptures and on the ancient foundations of the Church, and on the teaching of the Fathers; that they preached the Gospel, administered the sacraments and inculcated obedience to the civil authorities. In a word, the Confession set forth a complete refutation of all the accusations that had been made against them.

The effect upon the Catholics was indeed great. The Emperor exclaimed: "The Protestants do not err in the articles of faith."* Bishop von Stadion said: "What has been read is true, the pure truth, and we cannot deny it;" † and he declared that he would concede both forms, the eucharist and the marriage of priests, rather than see the parties separate from each other.‡ Matthew Lang, Archbishop of Salzburg, said: "The Mass and the prohibition about eating, and other human regulations, are not right, but it cannot be endured that a miserable monk should do all the reforming." § Duke William of Bavaria, after having heard the Confession read, not only spoke kindly

* Coelestin.
† Walch, *Introductio*, p. 176.
‡ C. R. II., 150.
§ J. J. Müller, p. 589.

to the Elector of Saxony, but assured him of his good will, and said he had been differently informed about Luther's teaching; and when Eck told him that Luther's teaching could be refuted from the Fathers, but not from the Scriptures, he replied: "As I understand the matter, the Lutherans sit on the Scriptures and we alongside of them." *

"Even that great persecutor of the truth, Duke Henry of Brunswick, invited Melanchthon to his table, was very friendly, and assured him that he could not deny the articles in regard to both forms, the marriage of priests and the prohibition of meats. Archbishop Hermann of Cologne, Palsgraf Frederick, Duke Erick of Brunswick-Lüneburg, Henry Duke of Mecklenburg, the Dukes of Pomerania, Count George Ernest of Henneberg, and even the Emperor's confessor, a Spanish barefoot monk, also Paul Ricener, King Ferdinand's physician, were all convinced of the truth, only they did not freely confess it. The Confession made a very strong impression on the Elector Hermann of Cologne, who not only showed the closest attention during the reading, but afterwards often read it through and tested it according to God's Word, and in 1536 began a reformation in his own archbishopric." †

But the supreme benefit to the Lutherans was that, as their Confession quickly spread over Germany, and, indeed, over all Europe, it disabused innumerable minds of the prejudices that they had entertained in regard to the Lutheran doctrine and practice, and converted enemies into friends. The Lutheran Church had taken the place of the Lutheran party, and now began to go forth conquering and to conquer.

* Rotermund, p. 102.
† Rotermund, *Geschichte der Augsb. Confession,* p. 102.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

THE Augsburg Confession is a historical document. It arose in an age of great events. It is itself a great event. It has been in active operation for nearly four hundred years. It has itself made history. Kings and potentates have fought against it. Kings and potentates have fought for it. It has been laid down as the foundation of civil and religious alliances. Treaties between nations have rested upon it. It has determined and helped to determine the religious and ecclesiastical destiny of the vast majority of the Protestant peoples of the whole world. It has shaped more theological thinking and writing than all other Protestant confessions together. It still lives and moves and acts. Millions of Christians own and acknowledge it as the summary of their faith. Millions would surrender their lives rather than surrender the truths which it embodies and enshrines and inculcates.

A marvelous document, then, is this Augsburg Confession. In depth and compass of influence it has no equal in Protestant Christendom. The philosopher, the theologian, the historian, has each made it the subject of his reflections, but no man has yet adequately set forth the qualities of its greatness. It may be doubted whether its author fully understood it, and whether the witnesses who subscribed it fully comprehended its contents and its significance. And we may say that no estimate of the Augsburg Confession that has ever been given has satisfied either its friends or its foes. It stands as a sort of mystery of the ages, embodying a history of the past and enshrining a prophecy of the future. Each generation investigates its history anew and interprets its prophecy afresh. The fact that it has survived the attacks of its foes, and the defenses of its friends—both often alike injudicious—is evidence that it is endowed with preternatural vitality. And yet the Augsburg Confession is not perfect. It does not contain all that we have a right to desire in it, nor is everything which it contains in the form and in the degree which we have a right to expect that they should be. We must take it as it is, noting well

its content and pointing out the *desiderata*. As a historical document it must be described and interpreted historically. We have no right to say *dogmatically* what the Augsburg Confession ought to have been, or ought not to have been. We cannot transport ourselves back to the year 1530 and have the mind in us that was in the author and in the subscribers of the Augsburg Confession. They faced a great exigency and wrought a great work. We might have failed. Hence, instead of moralizing or of philosophizing, or of dogmatizing, we content ourselves with the humbler, but the more profitable, service of describing the Augsburg Confession, and that chiefly in the words of those who, as special students of its history and as adherents to its teaching, speak from fulness of knowledge and from loyalty of appreciation.

1. *Estimates of Historians.*

Leopold von Ranke, after describing the origin of the Confession and Melanchthon's effort to verify the articles, not only by appeal to the Scriptures, but also to the Fathers, says: "And in my opinion it can by no means be denied that the doctrine as it appears here is yet the product of the living spirit of the Latin Church, which still existed within its fold, of all its productions perhaps the most remarkable, intrinsically the most significant. In the very nature of the case it bears the complexion of its origin, in that the fundamental conception, which proceeded from Luther in the article of justification, imparted to it characteristics of individuality. But this is true of all things human. The same fundamental conception came into active prominence more than once in the Latin Church. Luther only laid hold of it again with all the energy of religious need, and in the conflict with opposing conceptions and in presenting it to the people, gave it universal validity. No man can say that as it appears here it contains anything that is sectarian. Hence they (the Lutherans) opposed the more accidental dogmatic formulæ as they had appeared in the later centuries. They were not inclined to ascribe normative and demonstrative authority to a Church Father, but they were conscious that they had not severed themselves essentially from his conception. There is a secret tradition which does not express itself in formulæ, but rather in the original conception of the idea, which is not determined by all the necessity which it seems to have, and yet it dominates the activity of the thinking, creating spirit. They felt that they still stood on the old foundation as it had been fortified by Augustine. They tried to break

down the particularism by which the Latin Church had allowed itself to be fettered in the later centuries, and to cast off the yoke. They went clear back to the Scripture and held to its letter. But were not the Scriptures for a long time earnestly studied even in the Latin Church, and held to be the norm of faith? Was not much which was received by this Church actually grounded in the Scriptures? To this they held. The rest they let go.

"I do not venture to say that the Augsburg Confession establishes dogmatically the meaning of the Scriptures. It is only an effort to bring back the system developed in the Latin Church to the point of agreement with the Scriptures, or to a conception of the Scriptures in the original spirit of the Latin Church, which had wrought so unconsciously that no one had bound himself to any manifestation of it. Our Confession is its purest, its most genuinely Christian manifestation, as it proceeds most directly from its source." *

Friedrich von Bezold, Professor in the University of Erlangen, has written as follows: "By the force of external circumstances Melanchthon, who had been shoved into the place of Luther, showed himself a diplomatist both in the Confession and during the negotiations at Augsburg. It could perhaps be said that the Erasmian qualities of this learned man had an opportunity for the first time rightly to unfold themselves, when, separated from the dominating presence of Luther, he ventured to take an independent position. Already in that document, which originally was not regarded as a confession, but as an 'Apology,' as a vindication against the Romish accusations, he took all pains to extend the fraternal hand to the Catholics, in that he emphasized as strongly as possible the connection with the ancient Church as it had been continually maintained by Luther, and dropped into the background the irreducibly divisive elements or entirely passed them by in silence. For example, the divine right of the papacy, the *character indelebilis* of the priesthood, the sacraments as numbering seven, remained undiscussed, while in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper a form was selected which is so ambiguous that the Catholic theologians could only lament the lack of an express recognition of transubstantiation. The harsh doctrine of predestination was omitted. For justification by faith and for other evangelical fundamental doctrines appeal is to be made not

* *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. Dritter Band.* Siebente Auflage, pp. 173, 174.

only to the testimony of the Scriptures, but also to that of the Church Fathers. The entire purpose was to show that the exclusion of the Lutherans from the Church was unjustifiable, and to exhibit the whole controversy in the harmless light of a 'difference in regard to some traditions and abuses.' And yet Melanchthon feared that 'many would take offense at our candor,' as if offense with the opposite party could have been avoided without complete submission! Ranke judges not incorrectly that 'the doctrine as it here appears is yet a product of the living spirit of the Latin Church, which still existed within its bosom.' But even if many of those expressions of Catholic princes and prelates, which the Protestant tradition has reported, be recognized as true, it was nevertheless a prodigious misconception of the nature of the Romish Church to suppose that there remained the possibility of any other agreement than that between victors and vanquished. From the beginning Melanchthon had confidently reckoned that a complete renunciation of the Zwinglians would not fail to make its impression upon the Catholics and upon the Emperor.'' *

Gustav Kawerau, formerly Professor of theology in the University of Breslau, now at Berlin, after briefly reciting the history of the composition of the Confession, continues thus: ''The Augsburg Confession means to be estimated historically as a proof that the Evangelical Estates, notwithstanding their innovations, belonged to the *Catholic* Church. As a *party* standing within the bosom of the Church, and contending for the right of existence, it faced the opposing party in an effort to prove its agreement with the Church's recognized Articles of Faith (nos nihil docere contra ullum fidei articulum), to fortify its particular form of doctrine not only by the Scriptures, but also with the testimonies of recognized Catholic authorities, and to prove that all its innovations concerned the abolition of the abuses that had entered. Hence that there is nothing in their doctrine which differs from the Scriptures *or from the Catholic Church or from the Roman Church* in so far as it is known from writers. . . . The entire difference has reference to some *few* abuses.† They separate their cause as sharply as possible from that of the Zwinglians and the Anabaptists. Their doctrine of the Lord's

* *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation*, pp. 619, 620.

† So read all the authoritative codices and the first exemplars of the *Editio Princeps*. See Tschackert, *Die unveränderte Augsb. Konfession*, p. 115, note 24. Kolde, *Historische Einleitung in die Symb. Bücher*, p. xxii., note 3.

Supper they conform as closely as possible to that of the Catholics without expressing dissent in regard to transubstantiation. The papacy, 'for reasons,' is absolutely not mentioned. Its doctrinal articles are set forth in harmony with the scheme of the Catholic Dogmatic. Important constituent parts of the Lutheran Gospel (for example, the Priesthood of Believers) are not mentioned. Nevertheless, Melanchthon succeeded here in bringing the Reformation doctrine of salvation to classic expression, and upon decisive points again and again he showed its importance with telling effect (especially in Art. 20). And as a matter of fact, despite the harking back to ecclesiastical authorities, the normative authority of the Scriptures is still made decisive.'' *

Theodor Kolde, Professor in the University of Erlangen, a specialist in the department of Symbolics, passes judgment on the Confession as follows: ''From its origin is to be explained the tone and the peculiar character of the Confession. It is at once a confession and an apology, and is intended to promote the cause of peace and to repel the reproach of departure from the original doctrine of the Church, and of fellowship with the sects. And the entire first part (Articuli praecipui fidei, Arts. 1-21) serves to show that the Evangelicals agree with the Catholic Church, and where they have perhaps departed from the traditional form of doctrine, in this they wish to restore the original true doctrine of the Church to the place of honor. In so far, Ranke is not wrong when he says 'that the doctrine as it here appears is yet a product of the living spirit of the Latin Church, which still existed in the bosom of the same.' Many points which we to-day regard as very important, and which even then were so, are not treated. The author was content, for instance, to confess the Lutheran doctrine of Baptism, and of the Lord's Supper in a few generic words.† There is no rejection of the other Romish sacraments, and Confession and Repentance are introduced in a way that does not exclude the possibility of conceiving that Repentance is also a sacrament. Transubstantiation is not rejected, and the sole authority of the Scriptures is not emphasized as a principle. And thus we can still find much wanting in it which the love of peace and necessity for united action at that time

* *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 3. Auflage, III., 108, 109. Kawerau notes the fact that the Lutherans continued till 1546 to represent themselves as having not departed in their Confession from the consensus of the Catholic Church. *Kircheng.*, 3. Auflage, III., 108, note 4.

† Melanchthon says, in a letter to Veit Dietrich: ''There is in it (the A. C.) an article on the Lord's Supper according to Luther's view.'' C. R. II., 142.

regarded as not well to insist upon. Luther would certainly have expressed himself very differently (Conf. De Wette, IV., 110), though the Confession contains nothing un-Lutheran. And despite the fact that the author had changed so much in it, it has from beginning to end a uniform character, and by means of the emphasis which it lays upon justification by faith alone in the fourth article, around which, to a certain extent, the other articles are grouped, and through which they receive their real confirmation, it brings the faith of the new evangelical churches to expression in an unique way.'' *

These four estimates of the Augsburg Confession agree in essentials. The eminent authors regard the Confession as *Catholic,* as *Lutheran,* as *evangelical,* but at the same time they hold that it is *defective,* and that it falls short of being a clear and full expression of Lutheranism. They all note the presence of the *Catholic* traditional teaching and the appeal to the Fathers of the Church. Alike they declare that the entire Confession is ruled by the article of justification by faith, which, without question, is a distinct Lutheran conception, since Luther almost from the beginning of his reformatory career had regarded that as ''the article of a standing and of a falling Church,'' meaning that the Church would stand so long as she held fast by this article, and would fall so soon as she let go this article. Three of our authors call attention to the fact that several doctrines peculiar to Rome's teaching, as well as articles on which the Reformers had laid great stress, are omitted from the discussion in the interest of peace and of the desire on the part of the confessors to make good their claim to be regarded as members of the Catholic Church, and to be distinguished from the heretics whom the Catholic Church had condemned. Three of them refer specifically to the article on the Lord's Supper and remark its close approximation to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on the subject, the ambiguity of the form of statement, and the silence in regard to transubstantiation, which had been most emphatically rejected by all the Reformers. Three of them declare that the Confession is a product of the spirit which still lived in the Catholic Church.

These estimates are generic rather than specific; but it cannot be denied that they well describe the Confession, both as to what it is and as to what it is not. They exhibit the Confession as Lutheran in a *negative* and *apologetic,* rather than in a *positive*

* *Realencyclopädie,* 3. Auflage, Art. *Augsb. Bekenntnis.*

and *aggressive* sense. It is no doubt true that the churches of the Evangelicals taught all that is contained in this Confession. In so far there was no misrepresentation. But there is misrepresentation if we take into consideration the *compass* of the teaching in the churches of the Princes and commissioners who had signed the Confession. The divine right of the papacy, the *character indelebilis* of the priesthood, the Romish theory of the sacraments, the *opus operatum,* purgatory, and the worship of saints, had been denounced in the churches times almost without number, and in language the most positive and bitter. All this is passed over in silence by the Confession as it was read and delivered to the Emperor. The doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, the doctrine of the sole authority of the Scriptures in matters of faith and salvation, and the doctrine of the *ecclesia invisibilis* as the essential Church in distinction from the ecclesiastical organization—these doctrines, which had been preached in the churches and had been taught in the schools and had been discussed in a widely disseminated literature, find no place in the Confession.

Therefore, while firmly maintaining that the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession express no doctrine that is *un*-Lutheran or *un*evangelical, that is, that is incapable of a Lutheran and an evangelical interpretation, we cannot hold that the statement made at the close of Article XXI., viz., that the doctrinal articles constitute about the sum of the doctrine preached and taught in the churches of the subscribing Princes and cities is correct. And by no means do we hold, as already we have indicated, that "the entire difference has reference to some few abuses." At the bottom of the whole Reformation movement, and at every step of its progress, was the question of doctrine, which has controlled and shaped, and which still controls and shapes, the course of Lutheranism. Hence we do not wonder that Luther should find fault with the Confession for consciously passing over certain important articles.*

* Enders, *Luther's Briefwechsel,* 8, p. 133. The tactics and diplomacy of Melanchthon at Augsburg and the deficiencies of the Augsburg Confession in its omissions of certain important articles of Lutheran teaching, have furnished a subject for frequent comment by Protestant and Catholic historians. See *Eine Katholische Beleuchtung der Augsburgischen Konfession* (1898) by Professor Tieme, of Leipzig, p. 31. Also see article by Pastor in the Catholic *Kirchenlexikon,* I., 1644-5, who notices the omission of "alone" from the article on Justification, and says: "The few deviations from the old doctrine are stated so vaguely and cautiously that an agreement must appear easy. Of several deviations it is expressly declared that they do not touch the essence of the doctrine. Several doctrines are

But we have now to do with the Augsburg Confession as it is, and not with our conception of what it ought to be. Its deficiencies we may deplore. Its contents make it the fundamental Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, which began its existence as a particular Church the moment this Confession was delivered to the Emperor Charles V., June 25, 1530.

2. *The Scheme of the Confession.*

The Augsburg Confession is not a system of theology, and was not meant to be such. It does not contain all the articles usually embraced in a system of theology. For instance, it has no article on *Holy Scripture,* none on the *Holy Spirit;* and yet the articles are not brought together in an arbitrary manner. In the main they follow each other in logical order, and are throughout ruled by a principle, that is, they have a *common center* in the *Article of Justification,* in the sense that other articles serve as the presupposition of this Article or receive their special form and complexion from this Article: The first three articles, which treat, respectively, of the "one divine essence," of Sin, of Christ, form the objective ground for the fourth Article, which teaches that man is not justified by reason of his own merits and works, but freely for the sake of Christ by faith. With this Article the next two are organically joined. This faith that justifies is obtained through the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, which are the means of grace employed by the Holy Spirit (Art. V.); and this same faith brings forth good fruit in obedience to the will of God, and is itself restated in words attributed to St. Ambrose (Art. VI.). Then, in logical order, comes the Article on the Church (VII.), which is the congregation of all who possess this justifying faith and have in common the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments as noted in Article VI. And to provide against the supposition that the means of grace can be effective only when ministered by godly men, it is declared that it is lawful, and hence not inefficacious, to use the ministry of ungodly men, since the Word and sacraments are of divine appointment, and hence have objective validity, or a validity not dependent upon the character of the ministrant. Articles IX. and X. particularize in regard to the sacraments, declaring, respectively, that God's

passed over in silence, especially that of the Primacy, of indulgences and of purgatory." See Jansen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes,* 17th and 18th editions, vol. III., 185 *et seqq.*

grace is offered in the one, and that the body and blood of Christ are present and are administered in the other; while in Articles XI. and XII., which form the sacrament of absolution or repentance (see Apology, Art. XIII.), it is declared that those who, after their baptism, have fallen, can obtain forgiveness of sin, provided they repent and believe in the Gospel; and Article XIII. completes the discussion of the sacraments by describing them as signs of grace (see Apology, Art. XXIV., C.). In Articles XIV. and XV. the Confession turns to the external organization of the Church, to the call of the ministry and to the proper observance of ecclesiastical rites. Article XVI. declares that civil government is an ordinance of God, and that Christians may hold public office, discharge the duties of subjects and enjoy the benefits of society. And in contrast with the order of this world, we are taught in Article XVII. that Christ will come at the end of the world to raise the dead and to judge all men and to assign them their portion forever.

These first seventeen articles form the trunk of the Confession. They are followed by four, which not only supplement, but supply independent testimony. They relate to the appropriation of salvation and to the Christian life. Article XVIII. recognizes the ability of man to work civil righteousness, but denies his ability to work spiritual righteousness without the grace and assistance of the Holy Spirit. Article XIX. supplements Article II. by declaring that not God, but the will of the devil and of the ungodly is the cause of sin. Article XX. supplements Article IV. by reaffirming that man is justified by faith for the sake of Christ, and that this is "the most important article of the Gospel"; and it supplements Article VI. by declaring yet more fully that good works must follow faith; while Article XXI. declares that we may imitate the faith and works of the saints, but that the Scriptures do not teach that they are to be invoked.

We thus see that justification by faith is the ruling thought of the first, or doctrinal, part of the Confession. It is this fact, preëminently, that makes the Confession Lutheran, and that saves it from the reproach of being a conglomerate of doctrines brought together without regard to a common center around which the articles are grouped, and without a principle to impart the quality of unity to the entire scheme. Hence justification by faith has been called the *material principle* of Lutheran Protestantism, by which is meant not that all the doctrines of Lutheranism are derived from that Article, but that, as already said, they all take

their form and complexion from the fundamental thought that men are justified by faith for the sake of Christ.

And none the less does this fundamental thought rule in the second part of the Confession. "As in the first, so in the second part, the doctrine of justification by faith is the fundamental evangelical doctrine, which forms the rule for the evangelical character of ecclesiastical institutions. The fundamental error of the Mass is that it is meant to be a justifying work (Art. 3), and yet the Scriptures teach that we are justified by faith alone. In regard to Confession it is observed that satisfactions are practiced without mentioning the righteousness of faith (Art. 4). The first doubt raised against the traditions is: 'The doctrine of grace and of the righteousness of faith, *which is the principal part of the Gospel*, is obscured, though it ought to stand out and be exalted in the Church, so that the merit of Christ be properly recognized, and that faith, which believes that sins are pardoned for the sake of Christ, be placed far above all works' (Art. 5). Twice more is it emphasized in this Article that the dangerous feature of those traditions is the thought that by this means grace can be acquired. In regard to monasticism it is repeatedly emphasized that it especially prejudices justification by faith. Also in the Article on spiritual power it is declared that the enactments of the Bishops have prejudiced the doctrine of justification (Art. 7).

"From this presentation it is evident that the Augsburg Confession holds justification by faith as the fundamental, the cardinal, doctrine of the Gospel, which must determine all the doctrines and forms of the Church. When in the fifth Article of the first part it says: 'By the word and sacraments the Holy Spirit is given, who works faith in those who hear the Gospel, namely, that God, for the sake of Christ, receives us into grace,' we realize that justification by faith is set forth as the sum of the Gospel. The same is said in Article 20, in which not merely the history of the Gospel, but also the effect of the Gospel, is designated as a matter of true faith: 'This article, namely, the pardon of sins, namely, that through Christ we have grace, righteousness and the pardon of sins.'" *

Professor O. Zöckler has judged the Confession in the same way. He calls Article IV. "the most concentrated expression of the Reformation consciousness," and declares that that Article "must be regarded as the ruling center, though the two follow-

* Kahnis, *Die Lutherische Dogmatik*, II., pp. 432-3.

ing articles form the necessary supplements, in so far as Article 5, *Of the Ministerial Office,* points to the root, and Article 6, *Of New Obedience,* to the fruit of justifying faith." He holds that the first seventeen articles contain the fundamental course of thought; that the next four are supplementary, and that the seven articles of the second part form a supplementary excursus.

In accordance with these general conceptions, Zöckler has constructed the following scheme of the Confession:

I. Fundamental Part.

(Fundamental Statement of the Doctrine of Salvation according to its Chief Factors).

[Art. 1-6 and supplementary Articles 18-21].

a) The Presuppositions of Salvation:

Art. 1. God.

Art. 2. Sin—its Effect on Free-will (Art. 18) and its Cause (Art. 19).

Art. 3. The Redeemer—(Prejudice to his sole Mediatorship through the Worship of the Saints (Art. 21).

b) Salvation itself:

Art. 4. Justification.

Art. 5. The Word of God and the Ministerial Office the ground of Justification.

Art. 6. The New Obedience as Fruit of Justification.

} Faith and Works (Art. 20).

II. Special-soteriological Part.

(The Mediation of Salvation in the Church).

[Art. 7-17 and practical-polemical Articles 22-28].

a) The *Objective* Mediation of Salvation in the Church.

α) The Church and the Means of Grace in Themselves: Art. 7, 8.

β) The Sacraments of the Church:

Art. 9. Baptism.

Art. 10. Lord's Supper (Both Forms: A. 22; Mass: A. 24).

Art. 11, 12. Confession, Repentance—(Worship and Discipline in Relation to Confession: A. 25).

Art. 13. The Use of the Sacraments.

γ) The Service of the Church or the Office of the Means of Grace:

Art. 14. Church Government—(Consecration of Priests : Art. 23 ; Power of the Bishops : Art. 28).

b) The *Subjective* or *Ethical* Mediation of Salvation.

α) Its Realization in this Life.

1. Art. 15 in the Regulations of the Church—(for example : Distinction of Meats : A. 26).
2. Art. 16 in the State and in the Family—(Compare the Articles on Priesthood [23] and Cloister-vows [27]).

β) Their Final Consummation through

Art. 17. The Return of Christ.*

* *Die Augsburgische Confession*, p. 95.

CHAPTER VIII.

ANALYSIS OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

The Augsburg Confession consists of four distinct, but closely related parts:

1. *The Preface,* which introduces the Confession, recites the occasion of its composition, the end had in view by the evangelical Princes in presenting their Confession, and their appeal to a general free council.

2. *The Principal Articles* of Faith (Articuli Fidei Praecipui: Artickel Christlicher Lahr), commonly spoken of as Part I. This part contains twenty-one articles, and exhibits "about the sum of the doctrine" taught in the churches of the subscribers.

3. *The Articles on Abuses* (Articuli in quibus recensentur Abusus mutati). This part contains seven articles, and is spoken of as Part II.

4. *The Epilogue,* which states that the principal abuses have been recounted, and that the subscribers are prepared to furnish additional information, should it be required.

In the codices* of the Confession, in the Melanchthon editions of the same, in the first edition of the Book of Concord (1580) German† and Latin, the articles of *Part I.* are given without titles. In the Latin *editio princeps,* and in the older Latin editions generally, these articles are numbered I., II., III., etc. In the German thus: Der Erste, Der Ander, Der Dritte. But in the German Book of Concord, first official edition, they are numbered thus: Der I. Artickel, Der II. Artickel.‡ In the first *Authentic* Latin edition of the Book of Concord (1584) these articles have the same titles that appear in modern editions of the Confession.§

In all the editions and recensions of the Confession that have

* Except that Article XX. in the codices has as title: Vom Glauben und Werken. De fide et bonis operibus. Tschackert, p. 102.

† Art. XX. has as title: Vom Glauben und Werken.

‡ Following the example of Coelestin, *Historia,* II., fol. 151 *et seqq.*

§ Following the example of Coelestin, *ibid.,* II., fol. 177 *et seqq.,* but not always giving the same titles that were given by Coelestin.

come to our notice, the Articles on Abuses, both Latin and German, have titles.

In the following analysis of the Articles, we introduce each article with a translation of the title given in the Latin Book of Concord of 1584. But our analysis is confined strictly to the Confession as it was delivered to the Emperor, as the same has been reproduced from authentic codices by Professor Tschackert,* for this, and this alone, the form delivered to the Emperor, must forever be held as the true, original, unaltered Augsburg Confession, the *editio princeps* being already a *varied edition,* and the later Melanchthon editions being still more varied.† And further: We place the German and the Latin texts exactly on a par as regards authority, though they do not always agree perfectly in their representations. And when we appeal to the Apology, this is done for the reason that the Apology, though an after-thought, and polemical in tone, is, nevertheless, the most authoritative explanation of the Confession.

1. *Analysis of Part I.*

Art. I. Of God.

1. The unity of the divine essence and the trinity of persons.

2. The one divine essence is God, with infinite attributes: "Creator of all things, visible and invisible."

3. The three persons are Father, Son and Holy Spirit, of the same essence and power, and co-eternal.

4. Person signifies not a part or a quality in another, but that which subsists by itself. In Greek: *Hypostasis.* Subsistence, not to be confounded with substance.

5. Appeal to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325. (The first General Council of the Church.)

6. Rejection of the heresies rejected by the early Church:

(a) The Manichæans, who from the 3d to the 7th century taught that there are two eternal antagonistic principles, light and darkness, the one the author of all good, the other the author of all evil.

(b) The Valentinians, a Gnostic sect, arose about the middle of the 2d century, and taught the existence of thirty eons, who had proceeded from the First Cause.

(c) Arians, followers of Arius (about 318), asserted that Christ was similar to God, but not very God.

* *Die unveränderte Augsburgische Konfession,* Leipzig, 1901.
† See Chapter XIV.

(d) Eunomians, 4th century, who held that Christ was created, and subordinate.

(e) Mahometans, followers of Mahomet (7th century), who teach that Christ is a great prophet, but not the Son of God in essence.

(f) Samosatanians, old (followers of Paul of Samosata, 3d century) and new (perhaps Lewis Hetzer and John Campanus), who denied the antenatal and personal deity of Christ, and held that the Word is only the voice, and that the Holy Spirit is the motion created in things.

Art. II. Of the Sin of Origin.

1. The universality of sin: "All men."

2. Propagated by natural generation: "Conceived and born with sins." The fall of Adam.

3. Description of the sin of origin: *Negative*: "Without true fear of God and without true faith in God." *Positive*: Disease and corruption of human nature in its origin. "These are the chief faults of human nature, conflicting especially with the first table of the Decalogue." *Apology.*

4. The evil effect of the sin of origin: Condemns and brings eternal death.

5. Remedy for the sin of origin: Regeneration:

(a) By the Holy Spirit as the efficient cause.

(b) Through Baptism, as a means of grace. (See Art. V.) "Baptism removes the imputation of original sin." *Apology.*

6. Condemnation of the Pelagians and of others (perhaps Zwingli is included), who deny that the sin of origin is sin.

7. Such detract from the sufferings and merit of Christ, and make justification before God a human acquisition.

Art. III. Of the Son of God.

This Article sets forth the doctrine of the person, the states, the work of Christ.

1. He is the Son of God. He became man by being born of the Virgin Mary. Has two natures united in one person. Is true God and true man. The hypostatic union.

2. The State of Humiliation:

(a) Conception, birth and circumcision.

(b) Education and visible intercourse with men. Matt. 13: 55; Luke 2: 48.

(c) Passion on the Cross.

(d) Death and burial.

3. State of Exaltation:*

(a) Resurrection from the dead.

(b) Ascension to Heaven.

(c) Session at the Right Hand of God. Theanthropos. ("Everything that is said about the Humiliation and Exaltation of Christ is to be assigned to the *Man*, for the divine nature can be neither humbled nor exalted. . . . Although the two natures are distinct, yet the person is one, so that all that Christ does and suffers, God has truly done and suffered, even though it happen to only one nature." Luther, *Kirchenpostille*. XII. 210).

4. The Offices of Christ:

(a) Is Mediator between God and man. "Christ suffered and died to reconcile the Father to us." *Apology.*

(b) As Priest offering himself a sacrifice for all the sins of men. Priestly Office.

(c) As Sanctifier of believers through the Holy Spirit. Prophet. King. ("He has risen again, to reign, and to justify and sanctify believers"). *Apology.*

(d) As Judge of the living and of the dead at his second coming. Art. XVII. (Expansion of Part II. of the Apostles' Creed).

Art. IV. Of Justification.

1. The ground of Man's Justification before God.

(a) *Negative*: Not his own person, nor work, nor holiness. No *meritum de congruo* nor *meritum de condigno.*

(b) *Positive:* For the sake of Christ, who suffered and died for us. Christ the all-sufficient Reconciler and Mediator. The meritorious Cause.

2. The human condition: Faith—not as something meritorious, but as instrument of appropriation. Instrumental cause. "Christ is not apprehended as Mediator, except by faith." *Apology.*

3. Its source: The grace of God. "The promise, and, that too,

* Of the *Descensus ad Inferos* Musaeus (*Epit. Form. Concordiae*, p. 313) says: "Tot opiniones quot capita," and that the adherents of the Augsburg Confession of his day differed widely in regard to this article. Up to and during the year 1530 Luther regarded it as belonging to the humiliation of Christ. In his sermon at Torgau, in 1533, he assigned it to the Exaltation of Christ. See *The Lutheran Quarterly* for July, 1889, p. 407. The *Formula of Concord* treats it as a part of the Exaltation. So the dogmaticians, as a rule. In the Confession the Descensus "is neither explained nor assigned to the Exaltation." Baumgarten, *Erleuterungen*, p. 41

gratuitous, and *the merits of Christ, as the price and propitiation.*" Apology.

4. Its character: A free gift. Imputation. "This faith God imputes for righteousness." "*This faith, encouraging and consoling in these fears, receives remission of sins, justifies and quickens.*" Apology.

5. The faith that justifies is *special,* is *personal.* The believer believes that *he himself* is received into grace, and that *his* sins are pardoned for the sake of Christ. *Fides est fiducia.* (*Um Christus willen, Propter Christum,* specially characteristic of Melanchthon).

6. Justification an instantaneous act of God. It occurs the moment men believe.

7. The doctrine founded in the Scriptures. Rom. III. and IV.

"Upon this Article depend all things which we preach and practice against the Pope, the devil, and the whole world. Therefore, we must be sure concerning this doctrine, and not doubt." Luther in the Schmalkald Articles. Part Second, I.

Art. V. Of the Ministry of the Church.

1. Note the connection of this Article with the preceding article: "This faith"—the way in which it is obtained.

2. Through the means of grace—the Word and the Sacraments. The instrumental cause of justifying faith.

3. By the operation of the Holy Spirit, who employs the means of grace as instruments. He is the efficient cause of faith. Works faith "where and when he will."

(a) Place and time are in God's keeping. ("As and where he will." Schwabach Arts. VII.).

(b) In those who hear the Gospel. All are meant. Particularistic Predestination is excluded.*

4. The preached Word the chief means of grace, referred to four times. Sacraments, the subordinate means of grace.†

(Sacraments not mentioned in the corresponding Marburg and Schwabach Articles, VIII., VII.).

5. The message of the Gospel: That God, for Christ's sake, justifies those who believe.

6. God instituted the ministerial office.

(a) It is, therefore, of divine origin.

* In the year 1531, Melanchthon wrote to Brentz: "In the Apology throughout I have avoided that long and inexplicable subject of Predestination." C. R. 2: 547.

† See *The Lutheran Quarterly* for July, 1894, p. 362.

(b) Its function is to preach the Word, and to administer the sacraments.

7. Men should hear the Word preached.

(a) As Law the Word of God reveals sin and its fruits.

(b) As Gospel, it is the preaching of forgiveness for the sake of Christ, and works faith. "The Gospel freely offers, for Christ's sake, to us who have been vanquished by sin and death, reconciliation, which is received, not by works, but by faith alone." *Apology.*

8. The Anabaptists are condemned, because they taught that the Holy Spirit can be received by human preparation, without the external Word. By "and others" reference is supposed to be made to the Papists, to Zwingli, Carlstadt and Schwenckfeld.*

"The Holy Ghost, to speak in proper order, gives this faith or his gift to no one, without preaching, or the Gospel of Christ preceding."

Art. VI. Of New Obedience.

1. "That faith," the faith that justifies, ought to produce good fruits and good works.

2. Good works do not precede, they follow faith.

3. Their necessity: *Debet, Oportet.* Not a matter of choice.

4. Their form: Things commanded by God. "We speak not of ceremonies, but of that law which prescribes in regard to the motives of the heart, namely, of the Decalogue. Because faith brings the Holy Spirit and begets a new life in hearts, it is necessary that it produce spiritual affections in hearts." *Apology.*

5. The Motive:

(a) For God's sake: Um Gottes willen, Propter voluntatem Dei.

(b) Not as a means of justification before God. "We receive remission of sin and righteousness through faith in Christ."

6. Appeal to the Ancients. Pseudo-Ambrose.

Art. VII. Of the Church.

1. The Church defined: The assembly of all believers. The congregation of the saints.

2. True marks of the Church: The pure preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments, in accordance with the Gospel.

* Baumgarten, *Erleuterungen,* p. 44; Walch, *Introductio,* p. 276.

3. Nature of the Church:

(a) One. No particular Church is the *one* Church, but of the *one*.

(b) Holy: Because in essence "the congregation of the Saints." *Ecclesia invisibilis.*

(c) Abiding. It must be and abide forever. "For this Kingdom of Christ, which the Holy Spirit vivifies, always exists." *Apology.* Matt. 16:18.

(d) Christian. Christ is its efficient cause.

4. The unity of the Church is not destroyed by dissimilar rites and traditions.

5. Consent in regard to the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments is sufficient.

Art. VIII. What is the Church?

1. Properly the Church is the assembly of all believers and saints. Art. VII. The *Ecclesia invisibilis.*

2. With the believers and saints are associated hypocrites, false Christians, and open sinners, not living members of the body of Christ: The empirical Church. *Ecclesia visibilis.* The ecclesiastical organization. "The Church, according to the external participation of goods and rites." *Apology.* "Members of the Church, according to the external fellowship of the signs of the Church, i. e., of Word, profession and sacraments." *Apology.*

3. The ministration of the Word and sacraments is of divine appointment. Their essential quality is not changed by the ministrant, who does not represent himself, but Christ. Matt. 23:2.

4. The validity depends upon the institution of Christ.

5. Lawful to use sacraments which are administered by wicked men.

(a) Wicked in life and conduct.*

(b) Not heterodox in doctrine.

"Impious teachers are to be deserted, because these do not act any longer in the place of Christ, but are antichrists." *Apology.* "When, therefore, they teach wicked things, they are not to be heard." *Apology.*

6. Rejection of the Donatists and "all others"—perhaps the Wyklifites are meant—who teach that it is not lawful to use

* "Here the duty of ministers to be in a state of grace and to be pious is not taught, nor is the full equivalence of the ministry of good and evil teachers affirmed, nor is even the necessary exclusion of blasphemous persons from the office of the ministry controverted." Baumgarten, *Erleuterungen,* p. 50.

the ministry of the ungodly, and hold that the ministry of such is ineffective.

7. The means of grace have objective validity. The immoral character of the ministry does not invalidate them. The Holy Spirit works faith by them. Art. V.

Art. IX. Of Baptism.

1. Baptism is necessary (German text). Necessary to salvation (Latin text).*

2. The grace of God is offered by Baptism.

3. Children are proper subjects for Baptism.

(a) By Baptism children are presented to God. (Sacrament of initiation).

(b) By Baptism children are received into God's favor—become acceptable to God.† (Means of grace. Art. V.).

4. Adults are not excluded from Baptism by the Article.

(At the time of the Reformation there were but few adult baptisms in Germany. Perhaps all the people, except Jews, had been baptized in infancy).

5. The Anabaptists, who teach that the Baptism of Children is not right, and that children are saved without Baptism, are condemned.

Art. X. Of the Lord's Supper.‡

1. The body and blood of Christ (German: "True body and

* In the Apology Melanchthon repeats, but does not explain, these words: "Baptism is necessary to salvation." It is a theological gloss to say with Baumgarten: "To be understood of the necessity of the ordinary means to salvation and of divine command." *Erleuterungen,* p. 51. The interpretation given by Gerhard is forced and is open to grave objection: "We teach that Baptism is indeed the ordinary sacrament of initiation and the means of regeneration absolutely necessary to all, even to the children of believers, for regeneration and salvation. Meanwhile, nevertheless, in the case of privation or of impossibility, the children of Christians are saved by an extraordinary and special divine dispensation. For the necessity of Baptism is not *absolute,* but *ordinate.*" *Loci* IX. (Cotta), p. 282. There is no proof that Melanchthon meant any such thing. He in no sense qualifies his *necessarius* (read the damnatory paragraph in the Latin text). There is no wonder that the Catholic Confutators "approved and accepted" the article "concerning Baptism—viz., that it is necessary to salvation." In the "Variata" Melanchthon added: "As a ceremony instituted by Christ." Gerhard declares that there is no promise appertaining to the children born outside of the Church. Such he commits to the judgment of God. *Ibid.,* p. 284.

† Very properly does Dr. Plitt say: "Child-faith is not a doctrine of the symbols." *Grundriss der Symbolik,* 4te Auflage, p. 101. As proof, he refers to *The Large Catechism.* Müller, *Die Symb. Bücher,* p. 494, Sec. 55, 57.

‡ This tenth article of the Augsburg Confession has been, and is still, interpreted by Roman Catholic theologians as teaching the Roman Catholic

true blood'') are truly present in the Lord's Supper. ''Under the form of bread and wine.'' (German.)

2. The body and blood (''true body and true blood'': German) of Christ are administered to the communicants. ''There administered and received.'' German. (No distinction is made between worthy and unworthy communicants.)

3. ''Therefore the opposite doctrine is also rejected.'' German text. ''And they disapprove those who teach otherwise.'' Latin text.

(''The brief antithesis of this article was without doubt directed against the so-called Swiss of that time.'' *)

doctrine of the Lord's Supper in its essential features. See Fabricius, *Harmonia Conf. Augustanae* (1587), pp. 188, 189.

What the Confutators principally desiderated in the Confession, namely, the *essentialiter* and the *mutari*, that Melanchthon supplied in the Apology, where he appeals to the Mass Canon of the Greek Church, and with approbation quotes Theophilact of Bulgaria: Panem non tantum figuram esse, sed vere in carnem mutari. The *vere et substantialiter adsint* in the Apology is taken from the Confutation. The words in the German text of the Confession: *Unter der gestalt des brots und weins* (Tschackert, p. 88) do not express the genuine Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In the Large Catechism Luther does not say: ''Under the form of bread and wine,'' but: ''In and under the bread and wine,'' which distinctly affirms the presence in the Lord's Supper of the bread and wine; whereas, in the words of the Confession, we have the very language of the Roman Catholic official teaching. See the Latin Confutation: *Sub specie panis et vini.* C. R. XXVII., 106, and in the German Confutation: *Unter der Gestalt des Brods, unter der Gestalt Weins.* C. R. XXVII., 196. See Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum,* Ed. VII., Index, p. 468, under: Christus fit praesens . . . manentibus duntaxat speciebus panis et vini, and the many references given. See Kolde, *Die Augsb. Konfession,* p. 35. Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte,* II., 330. Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte,* p. 820.

The *quae videntur* in the Apology is ambiguous. Every tyro in Latin knows that it can just as well be translated: ''Which seem'' (see the Latin dictionaries), as ''Which are seen.''

''Article 10, Of the Holy Supper, in its original form expresses the Catholic doctrine since it teaches that the true body and the true blood of Christ are truly present under the form of bread and wine, are administered and received.'' Pastor, in Catholic *Kirchenlexikon* (1882), I., p. 1644.

Dr. Calinich, Head Pastor in Hamburg, a learned Lutheran specialist on the Augsburg Confession, has discussed the question: ''Can the tenth Article of the Augustana be understood in the sense of transubstantiation?'' Beyond all question he establishes this proposition: ''In reality there is *no* expression in the Confession and Apology which speaks directly against the conception (Fassung) of transubstantiation, and *not one,* which *could* not also be interpreted by the opponents in *their* sense for transubstantiation.'' *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1873), pp. 541 *et seqq.* The question is not, ''What was Melanchthon's personal view?'' but ''What did he *concede* on this point *to the opponents* at the Diet of Augsburg?'' P. 549. For Melanchthon's personal view on the Lord's Supper, see C. R. II., 222.

* Schultze, *Handbuch zur Symbolischen Theologie,* p. 46. Erhard Schnepf, in his *Confessio de S. Coena,* says that the adverb *vere,* though admitted to be ambiguous, was employed because not one of all those who adhered to the Augsburg Confession agreed with the Zwinglians. Quoted by Cyprian in *Hist. der Augsp. Confession,* p. 56.

Art. XI. Of Confession.

1. Private Absolution, which presupposes Private Confession, was to be retained in the churches of the Confessors. (This is the office of the Keys.)

2. The enumeration of all sins is not necessary. For this is impossible. Ps. 19:13. According to the *Vulgate,* 18:13.*

Art. XII. Of Repentance.†

This Article contains four leading thoughts in the thetical part.

1. That all the fallen, who repent of sins committed after Baptism, can at any time return to the grace of God.

2. That the Church *ought* (debeat) to grant absolution to such.

3. The two parts of faith:

(a) Contrition and sorrow on account of the sin committed.

* In the fourth Lateran Council, 1215 (Mansi, 22, p. 1010), it was decreed that everyone, on coming to years of discretion, should confess all sins, at least once a year, to his own priest. In the Lutheran Church, private confession was at first *voluntary.* Later, in portions of the Lutheran Church, it was made obligatory, as a test of orthodoxy, and as a preparation for the Lord's Supper. "It is well known that in several Protestant countries, as in *Sweden, Denmark, Holland,* and *in several parts* of Upper Germany, confession was entirely abolished. In Saxony, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, it was all the more firmly held on to." Klepper, *Liturgik,* p. 240. See article in *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1896, especially pp. 357 *et seqq.* Tittmann, in his notes on the Augsburg Confession, says of Art. XI.: "The article teaches that *this Private Absolution* must be retained, not because it is of divine institution, but because it is salutary to afford this consolation to individuals when they hear the voice in the name of God announcing the forgiveness of sins, as it is well stated in the Apology. Hence, although the entire institution of Private Confession and Private Absolution is only human, nevertheless Melanchthon rightly says that it is impious to remove *Private* Absolution from the Church" (p. 82). See Ernesti, *Praelectiones,* edidit Redling, p. 74.

† It may be a question whether *Poenitentia* in this Article should be translated by *Repentance* or by *Penance.* In the first English translation of the Augsburg Confession (Taverner, 1536) we have "*Penance or Repentance*" in the title of the XII. Article, and *Penance* in the Article itself. But it is certain that Melanchthon regarded *Poenitentia* as a sacrament. In the Apology, writing of the number and use of the sacraments, and of the signs of a sacrament, he says: "Truly, therefore, the sacraments are Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Absolution, which is *sacramentum poenitentiae.*" From the German: "So now true sacraments are Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Absolution." "Since Article XIII., *De usu Sacramentorum,* is placed after Baptism, the Lord's Supper and Repentance, it is evident that the Augsburg Confession recognizes three sacraments. (See Apology, p. 202.) But the Schmalkald Articles enumerate two sacraments." Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte,* II., p. 331. "The three sacraments of the Augustana and the Apology are Baptism, Absolution, the Lord's Supper." Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte* (1906), p. 824. See *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1907, pp. 345, 346. With Luther, sacrament was *res sacra,* with Melanchthon it was *ritus.* See Apology, *De Numero et Usu Sacramentorum.*

(b) Faith, which believes the remission of sins for the sake of Christ.

4. Good works as the effect and consequence of repentance.

In the antithesis are condemned:

1. The Anabaptists, who deny that the justified can lose the Holy Spirit.

2. Those who contend that some persons may become so perfect in this life that they cannot sin.

3. The Novatians, who will not absolve the lapsed.

4. Those who do not teach that the pardon of sins comes through faith, but that it is merited by our satisfactions.

(Doubtless referring to some papal teachers. See Carpzov, *Isagoge,* p. 379, and Walch, *Introductio,* p. 302; Baumgarten, *Erleuterungen,* p. 57.)

Art. XIII. Of the Use of the Sacraments.

The use of the sacraments is:

1. External and ecclesiastical as marks of our profession. But more than that:

2. Internal: Signs and testimonies of the divine will towards us.

3. For the purpose of exciting and strengthening the faith of those who use them. Means of grace. Art. V., Effective Signs.

(a) To excite faith may refer to the baptism of children.

(b) To strengthen faith can refer only to adults.

4. Rightly used when received with faith.*

("Augustine says, the faith of the sacrament, and not the sacrament, justifies." *Apology.*)

Art. XIV. Of Ecclesiastical Orders.

1. Complementary to Article V.

2. Emphasis on *publicly:* Should not *publicly teach.* (Any private Christian may teach his own household, or administer the sacraments in case of urgent need.)

3. Vocation (*rite vocatus*) is the essential thing.

4. Vocation is mediated by the local Church or by the representative Church. Implies examination in regard to doctrine (1 Tim. 3), Christian character (2 Tim. 2:15), and motive.

* There is no antithesis to this Article, either German or Latin, as the Confession was read and delivered, nor to the German *Textus Receptus.* Tschackert, pp. 61, 92, 93.

(Ordination is of apostolic usage, but not of divine command.*)

ART. XV. OF ECCLESIASTICAL RITES.

1. This Article does not contradict Article VII.

2. Rites must be retained in the Church:

(a) If they are without sin.

(b) If they promote peace.

3. Rites are necessary:

(a) When well chosen they promote piety and assist in devotion.

(b) They aid in exercising Church discipline.

4. Rule for selecting and retaining Rites in the Church:

(a) They must be such as will not burden pious consciences.

(b) They must be such as will promote piety and good order.

5. Christians must be taught that rites and ceremonies are not an essential part of religion:

(a) That they do not reconcile God.

(b) That they do not merit grace.

("The chief service of God is to teach the Gospel." *Apology.*)

ART. XVI. OF CIVIL AFFAIRS.

1. The civil order is of divine appointment.

2. Christians are subjects of the civil order.

3. They owe obedience to the civil order.

4. They may enjoy the benefits of the civil order and discharge the duties of citizens, each according to his calling.

5. Obedience has its limitation. It is confined:

(a) To lawful ordinances.

(b) To things that do not command to sin.

5. The Article condemns:

(a) The Anabaptists, who opposed the civil order.

(b) Those who placed Christian perfection in the desertion of the civil order.

("Christian perfection consists not in the contempt of civil ordinances, but in the dispositions of the heart, in great fear of God, in great faith." *Apology.*)

ART. XVII. OF CHRIST'S RETURN TO JUDGMENT.

In its thesis this Article affirms:

1. The return of Christ:

* For more than three centuries after the Augsburg Confession was delivered, some Lutheran churches did not practice Ordination.

(a) At the last day. "End of the world": Latin.

(b) To judge.

2. The resurrection of all the dead.

3. The bestowment of eternal life upon the pious.

4. The condemnation of the devil and of wicked men to eternal punishment.

In its antithesis the article condemns:

1. The Anabaptists, who teach that the punishment of the wicked will have an end.

2. Chiliasts, who scatter Jewish opinions about the reign of Christ in the world before the resurrection of the dead.

(John Denck and Louis Hetzer are supposed to be meant. Walch, *Introductio,* p. 313.)

Art. XVIII. Of Free-will.*

1. Civil righteousness is distinguished from spiritual righteousness.

(a) The former has as its object the things of this life. In the Apology: "Carnal or human righteousness, righteousness of works."

(b) The latter has for its object God, his righteousness, spiritual blessings.

2. Free-will (the natural man) has of itself some power to work civil righteousness.

3. Only by the grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit can man work spiritual righteousness, that is, become acceptable to God—"heartily fear God, or believe, or cast innate evil desire from the heart." (German text).†

(a) Absolute passivity neither expressed nor implied.

(b) Some activity on the part of man clearly implied. "Faith is not only knowledge in the intellect, but also confidence in the will, that is, it is to will and to accept that which is offered in the promise, namely, reconciliation and remission of sins." *Apology.*

4. Appeal to Augustine. He is not the author of the book quoted. Authorship in doubt.

5. Nothing new in this teaching. Has been constantly taught by the Church.

(The antithesis first appears in the Latin *editio princeps.* It

* By *Free-will* (*Liberum Arbitrium*) in the Lutheran theology is meant the will (voluntas) conjoined with the intellect. *Loci Communes,* C. R. XXI., 653. Ernesti, *Praelectiones* (1878), p. 86.

† See *The Lutheran Quarterly* for April, 1907, pp. 203 *et seqq.*

is wanting in all the Codices. "*This paragraph was not in the original as delivered.*")*

Art. XIX. Of the Cause of Sin.

1. God creates and preserves nature. But:
2. God is not the author or cause of sin.
3. The depraved will of the wicked is the cause of sin. "The perverted will works sin in all the wicked and in the despisers of God" (German).
4. When God does not help, the will of the wicked turns away from God. John 8:44.

Art. XX. Of Good Works.

1. Supplementary to Articles IV. and VI.
2. Refutation of the accusations that the subscribers forbid good works.
3. In their writings they admonish to the performance of good works.
4. Their opponents mostly preach of puerile performances.
5. Their opponents teach that we are justified by faith and works.
6. Our works do not reconcile us to God.
7. Grace and justification are acquired only through faith for the sake of Christ.
8. The doctrine of faith is the most important doctrine in the Church.
9. The conscience is not tranquilized by works, but only by faith.
10. Faith is the confidence which comforts and reassures frightened souls.
11. The doctrine of faith does not forbid good works.

Art. XXI. Of the Worship of the Saints.

1. The saints are to be remembered.
2. They are to be imitated as examples in doing good.
3. The Scriptures do not teach that the saints are to be worshiped and invoked for assistance.
4. Christ the only Reconciler and Mediator between God and man. (German text.)
5. The highest form of worship according to the Scriptures is to seek and to invoke Christ in every case of need. (German

* Tschackert, *ut supra*, pp. 101-103.

text, which in this article is the original, and differs much from the Latin translation).

The Conclusion to Part I.

1. Affirms agreement of the Confession:
(a) With the Scriptures.
(b) With the Universal Church.
(c) With the Roman Church.
2. Reproaches the opponents with unkindness in charging the Confessors with heresy.
3. "The total difference (*tota dissentio*) has reference to some few abuses." ("Is this true? Does a *Lutheran* differ from the Romanists only on the subject of ecclesiastical rites? Certainly not. And for this reason learned men have been greatly exercised over this passage.") *

Neither is this true: "The difference and quarrel are chiefly about some traditions and abuses." German text. The Reformation was preëminently a revolt against the *doctrinal* teaching of the Roman Catholic Church.

(The words *tota* and *paucis* did not appear in the second form of the *editio princeps,* nor in later printed editions.) †

4. In great part the ancient rites are carefully observed.
5. It is a calumny to say that all ceremonies have been abolished by the Confessors.

2. *Analysis of Part II.*

The Prologue.

1. Connects Part I. with Part II.
2. "Only some few abuses have been omitted." (Which is only a part of the truth.)
3. The doctrine is in accord with the Scriptures or the common Christian Church.
4. The Emperor is importuned:
(a) To give gracious audience to the Confessors.
(b) Not to hear those who scatter calumnies among the people.
5. Ceremonies properly rendered conserve and promote reverence and piety among the people.

* Ernesti, *Praelectiones* (1878), p. 97.
† Tschackert, *ut supra,* p. 61; Kolde, *Historische Einleitung in die Symb. Bücher,* p. XXII., note 3.

I. Of Both Species.

1. In the Lord's Supper both species are given to the laity.
2. This custom sanctioned:
(a) By the Scriptures. Matt. 26:27; 1 Cor. 11:26-28.
(b) By the early Church teachers.
(c) By the Canons of the early Church.
3. Communion under one species is an innovation. Contrary to the divine command.
4. The Procession is omitted. Because:
(a) It does not agree with the institution of Christ.
(b) Is a division of the sacrament.

II. Of the Marriage of Priests.

1. To avoid scandal priests are allowed to marry.
2. The marriage of such is justified by the Scriptures: 1 Cor. 7:2, 9; Matt. 19:12; Gen. 1:28.
3. Vows of celibacy cannot take away the commandment of God.
4. The marriage of priests allowed in the ancient Church.
5. An innovation in Germany. "Four hundred years ago."
6. God instituted marriage as a remedy for human infirmity. ("Is this true? since God instituted marriage already before the Fall. The language here must be understood of the institution of marriage which was repeated after the Fall.") *
7. Human laws cannot abolish or change the divine commandment. (German text, which is about twice the length of the Latin text.)

III. Of the Mass.

1. The accusation that the Mass had been abolished in the churches of the Confessors is repelled.
2. The Mass is retained and celebrated with reverence.
3. Almost all the usual ceremonies are retained.† Quod vero non ad vivum resecandum. Ernesti.
4. The mode of celebrating the Mass: Communicants were privately examined as to fitness.‡

* Ernesti, *Praelectiones, ut supra,* p. 102.

† For the more correct apprehension of the case, see Luther's *Formula Missae* (1523), and his *Deutsche Messe* (1526), and the many *Kirchenordnungen* that had been already introduced.

‡ Explicat modum celebrandae missae, mempe ut non modo sacerdos panem et vinum sumat, sed omnis populus, qui adsit, si qui sunt idonei, h. e. qui antea explorati sunt, vel privatim in aedibus sacerdotis, vel in sella confessionaria. Ernesti, *ut supra,* p. 103. Many of the earlier Lutheran *Kirchenordnungen* order the priest to commune first.

5. Private Masses have been abolished. Because:

(a) They have been regarded as a work to satisfy for daily sins.

(b) They are contrary to the ancient custom of the Church.

6. They are celebrated on holidays and at other times, if any wish to use the sacrament.

IV. Of Confession.

1. The practice and doctrine of the Lutherans in regard to Confession:

(a) It is not abolished.

(b) As a rule the sacrament is administered only to those who have been examined and absolved.

(c) It is to be highly regarded, inasmuch as it is the voice of God.

(d) Faith is required, which believes that absolution is a voice from heaven. This belief in Christ obtains the remission of sins.

2. Enumeration of sins not necessary. Art. XI. Ps. 19:31; Jeremiah, 17:9.

3. The ancients did not regard enumeration of sins as necessary.

4. Confession is of human authority. "Confession is not commanded by the Scriptures, but was instituted by the Churches." German text.

5. Confession is retained on account of Absolution, which is its chief part.

V. Of the Distinction of Meats.

1. The common opinion is that human traditions are works which serve to merit grace.

The evil effects of such an opinion:

(a) The doctrine of grace and justification is thereby obscured.

(b) Traditions obscure the commandments of God.

(c) They bring great danger to consciences.

2. The allegation that the Lutherans hinder all good discipline is rejected.

3. Very many ceremonies and traditions are observed, as reading in the Mass and singing.

4. Such ceremonies do not justify before God.

5. Such freedom in external ceremonies was maintained by the ancient Fathers.

VI. Of the Vows of Monks.

1. It is lawful to contract marriage, since it is in accord with the commandment of God.

2. Cloister vows are not obligatory. They lack the qualities that make vows obligatory.

3. They obscure the righteousness of faith.

4. They deceive the people by holding up false views of sanctity.

VII. Of Ecclesiastical Power.

1. The power of the Keys, or the power of the Bishops, is the power or command to preach the Gospel, to forgive and to retain sins, and to administer the sacraments.

2. The spiritual and the civil powers must not be confounded with each other.

(a) The spiritual power has the command to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments.

(b) The civil power administers the external affairs of men.

(c) The Bishops have no divine right to administer civil affairs or to carry the sword. They have such power only by human right.

3. The Lutherans teach that the Bishops have no power to teach anything contrary to the Gospel.

4. It is contrary to the divine command to burden the Church with the bondage of the law, as though we ought to merit grace by Levitical observances.

5. Bishops or Pastors may make ordinances that will promote good order in the Church, but not for the purpose of meriting grace.

6. St. Peter forbids the Bishops to oppress the Church.

7. Bishops are besought not to force consciences to sin.

8. It is not proposed to deprive the Bishops of their power. They are besought to allow the Gospel to be purely preached.

(The German text of this and of the preceding article is very much longer than the Latin.)

The Epilogue.

1. Only the chief articles, about which there has been controversy, have been treated.

2. Many abuses, causing endless contentions, have been passed over in the interest of gentleness.

3. Nothing has been said in unkindness.

4. Nothing has been received in doctrine or in ceremonies contrary to the Scriptures or to the Catholic Church.

5. In obedience to the Imperial Edict, these Articles are delivered "as a declaration of our Confession and of our doctrine."

6. If further information be desired, it will be presented according to the Scriptures.

Then follow the signatures, according to the German critical text, thus:

John, Duke of Saxony, Elector, etc.

George, Margrave of Brandenburg, etc.

Ernest, Duke of Brunswick and Lunenburg, etc.

Philip, Landgrave of Hesse.

John Frederick, Duke of Saxony.

Francis, Duke of Brunswick and Lunenburg.

Wolfgang, Prince of Anhalt.

Albert, Count and Lord of Mansfeld; and the Cities Nürnberg and Reutlingen.

The same names, with the omission of Albert, in the same order, are attached to the Latin critical text. The German *textus receptus* appears without the names of John Frederick, Francis and Albert. In the *editio princeps,* both Latin and German, the name of Albert does not appear.*

While the Diet was yet in session at Augsburg, the cities Weissenburg, Heilbronn, Kempten and Windsheim declared their approval of the Confession.

* Tschackert, *Die unveränderte Augsburgische Konfession,* pp 230, 231.

CHAPTER IX.

THE CATHOLIC CONFUTATION.

CHARLES V. was by nature and by practice *pious,* as the word *pious* was understood in his day; that is, he was ardently devoted to the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, and instant in the observances of religion. He also felt that by virtue of his position as Emperor he was the protector of the Church. But he was of a mild and pacific disposition, and possessed a fair amount of independence. These estimable qualities of his nature were shown in Italy, when, in opposition to the will of the Pope, he decided to call a diet in order to settle the disputes about religion in Germany; were shown in his Proclamation that the opinions and views of both parties should be considered with patience and charity; and were shown none the less when in Germany he refused to determine his attitude towards the Protestants by the clamors and counsels of the Catholic Princes and theologians.

Hence it was in the spirit of moderation, and not in the spirit of violence, that he undertook to act the difficult part of mediator between the Church of Rome and the dissidents in Germany, who had introduced new doctrines and ceremonies, had refused to obey the Edict of Worms, and had sent to the throne a protest against the decision of the Catholic majority at Speyer in 1529. Moreover, these Lutherans, as they were now generally called, had avowed their loyalty to his person and to his rule. They had also just complied with his command to deliver, in writing, a confession of their faith and a statement of their grievances. This document was also a state-paper. The Emperor was bound by the promises of his Proclamation and by the nature of his office as ruler to give it official attention. Besides, this document had called into existence a distinct party of religionists, who were conscious of standing, and who had convinced others that they were standing in at least some sort of opposition to the Church of Rome. For these and other reasons, the Protestant Confession could not be ignored. Then, too, the Emperor had declared, when the Confession was delivered, that he would take into consideration the matters of which it treated.

He was now face to face with a great obligation and with a great occasion. The Confession made by the Protestants could not be ignored.

1. *Preparations for the Confutation.*

Sunday, June 26th, the day after the reading and delivery of the Confession, the Emperor summoned the Catholic Estates to a council. Here, according to a report rendered by Melanchthon, three methods of procedure were proposed: "The first was the most ferocious, namely, that the Emperor should simply force all the Princes and the people to obey the Edict of Worms. The second was more moderate, namely, that our Confession should be committed to good and learned men who are allied with neither party, that they may pass judgment upon it. This was proposed by King Ferdinand. A third now seems to have prevailed, namely, that a confutation of our Confession be read to us." *

According to others, two distinctly opposite propositions were made. The one was that the Emperor should take up arms and enforce the old Edict. The Archbishop of Salzburg said: "Either we must oust them or they will oust us. Which of the two becomes us?" Another violent member of the Council, alluding to the fact that the Confession had been written with black ink, was heard to say: "Were I Emperor I would add to it red rubrics," to whom another remarked: "Sir, only look out lest the red spurt into your own face." But by no means were all disposed to such violence. The Archbishop of Mayence pointed out the danger that would come from an open breach, should an attack be made by the Turks.†

Milder counsels prevailed. Finally it was decided that a Reply should be made to the Confession of the Protestants. But this Reply dare not be of the nature of a counter-confession, neither dare it stop with a mere criticism of the Protestant Confession. It must take into the account certain conditions existing in the Church. Hence, in a written opinion handed to the Emperor the next day, it was recommended that the Protestant Confession should be examined by a committee of learned and unobnoxious men, who should approve all that agreed with the teaching of the Catholic Church, and refute all that stood in opposition to that teaching. For the correction of existing abuses the Emperor should provide the necessary ways and means.

Charles laid this opinion before Cardinal Campeggius, the

* C. R. II., p. 175.
† See Von Ranke, *ut supra*, p. 179.

Papal Legate, who heartily approved it, and at once elaborated a plan of procedure: The statements of the Protestants were to be investigated as to their correctness, and everything that had been masked "should be unmasked with modesty, wisdom, courtesy, and with all Christian charity." Everything in the Confession that accorded with the teaching of the Fathers should be approved, and everything found in it that deviated from the true religion should be completely annihilated, in order thus to show that all such teaching had been already condemned. Should the Protestant Princes complain that their theologians had been misjudged, the objections thus raised should be disproved by appeal to the Confession. The heretical propositions found in the Confession should be met by positive and well-grounded statements from the teaching of the Catholic Church. And as the Protestant Confession had been composed both in the Latin and in the German language, so should the reply be composed in the same languages. Then, after it had been submitted to the Emperor, and had been examined by the Princes, it should be read before the Diet. Finally Charles was reminded of the conduct of Charles the Great, who first overthrew the Saxons, and then brought them into the Church; that is, Charles V. should, in case of need, subdue the Protestants by force of arms, and thus save them to the Church.

Not all of these suggestions were approved by the Emperor, but it was decided to appoint a committee to examine and to refute the Protestant Confession, and Cardinal Campeggius was placed in charge of the entire procedure, even including the appointment of the committee,* consisting of twenty or more theologians, who had either been ordered to Augsburg by the Emperor, or had come thither in the retinues of the Catholic Princes.† In this committee were men of high position, ample

* See *Die Konfutation des Augsburgischen Bekenntnisses.* Ihre erste Gestalt und ihre Geschichte. Von Johannes Ficker. P. xx.

† Spalatin reports twenty. Luther's *Werke,* Jena, V., p. 40. Brentz reports twenty-four. C. R. II., p. 180. Others report twenty-two, and others twenty-six. It is probable that twenty is the original number, and that others were added, or were substituted for those who were excluded from the meetings and conferences of the committee because of their love of mildness and peace. Eck gives the number twenty-six. The following is regarded as the official list: John Eck, Prochancellor of the University of Ingolstadt; John Fabri, Provost in Ofen and Coadjutor Bishop at Vienna; Augustine Marius, Suffragan of Würzburg; Conrad Wimpina, Professor of Theology at Frankfort; John Cochlaeus, Court Preacher to George of Saxony; Paul Haug, Provincial of the Order of Preachers; Andrew Stoss, Provincial of the Carthusians; Conrad Collin, Prior of the Dominicans at Cologne; Conrad Thoman, Presbyter at Ratisbon; Barthol-

learning and commanding influence. For years some of them had been engaged in violent controversy with the Wittenberg Reformers, and particularly with Luther. This is especially true of Eck, Fabri and Cochlaeus, who had paraded hundreds and hundreds of errors against the Wittenberg teaching. And yet these men were charged to do and to write nothing that savored of rashness or violence, for it was the policy of the Emperor and of the Catholic Princes to act with moderation, and simply to refute the errors of the Protestant Confession.

But already before their official appointment on the committee, even as early as June 26th and 27th, some of them had been getting ready to make reply to the Protestant Confession. Indeed, the minds of some of the theologians were made up against the Confession. They regarded it as a work of dissimulation, of deception, of concealment, and as in contradiction with the teaching of the theologians of the Princes. In a word, the Confession was prejudged, and the theologians of the Princes were to be assailed by those who for years had been their most violent and bitter antagonists.

Such is the psychology of the situation, and the knowledge of this fact, that is, of the mental attitude of the chief confutators, is absolutely necessary for a clear and correct understanding of the Confutation as it appears in its first form, for in this form the Confutation can scarcely be called a Reply to the Confession, but a prolix and violent polemic against the preachers of the Princes, and especially against Luther, who is belabored with epithets and imputations.

2. *The Composition of the Confutation.*

The committee came to its appointed work with fulness of preparation and with an abundance of materials. Several of its members were experienced controversialists, and had the confidence of their party. They had in their hands several copies of the Latin Confession which the Emperor had caused to be made for their use. Some of them had brought with them bundles of

omew Arnoldi of Using; John Mensing, Court Preacher to Joachim of Brandenburg; John Dietenberger, Canon of Mayence; John Burkhard, Vicar of the Order of Preachers; Peter Speiser, Vicar to the Bishop of Constance; Arnold of Wesel, Canon of Cologne; Medard, Court Preacher to King Ferdinand; Augustine Tottelin, Theologian of Bremen; Wolfgang Redorfer, Provost of Stendal; Hieronimus Montinus, Vicar to the Bishop of Passau; Matthias Kretz, Preacher at Augsburg. See Salig, *Historia*, I., 229 *et seqq.* Laemmer, *ut supra*, pp. 145, 146. C. R. XXVII., 3, 4. J. J. Müller, *Historie*, 655, 656. Spalatin, *Annales*, pp. 140, 141.

extracts from the writings of Luther, and books which they and others had written against the Lutheran heresy. For use at the Diet of Speyer, in the year 1524, a number of theologians had been commanded by their Princes to make extracts from the writings of Luther. Cochlaeus had extracted ninety-one errors from three of Luther's sermons, and from thirty-six of his postils he had collected five hundred. There were also Eck's four hundred and four Articles, of which we have already spoken. Fabri had made collections of heretical passages from Luther's writings. Especially had he sought to show that during the last ten years Luther's writings had abounded in contradictions: "One book contradicts another; one sentence, one statement, contradicts another; yea, one letter contradicts another—in a word, Luther, instead of being a man, has become a mad, irrational beast." *

This collection of contradictions, to which was prefixed a Preface, Fabri was encouraged by Ferdinand to deliver to the Emperor. The object in view was to inflame the mind of Charles against the Lutherans, and to turn him from his accustomed course of moderation. And surely, if it had been in the power of calumnies and detractions to effect such a result, it would have been effected by this Preface. For here Luther is "called that apostate, the most pestiferous pest of the Church of God." "Luther is as far from the Martyrs as the Holy Spirit is from Satan, as a lie is from the truth." "From being a pious monk he has become a most dissolute apostate; from being a chaste priest he has become a most foul whoremonger; from being a man of modesty, he has become a most loquacious buffoon; from being orthodox, he has become a heretic; from being a Christian, he has become an apostate; in a word, instead of being a man, he has become a brute and an irrational animal." "A heretic, that is, one who against his own conscience has introduced the most abominable and unheard-of heresies, and has taught the people the most pernicious doctrines." "Luther tries to pluck up by the roots the authority of the Church, the decrees of the councils and the decisions of the Holy Fathers and of the Popes." "Ought we, therefore, hesitate to reject and to condemn the capricious writings of Luther and the heretics of our country, since he says one thing when he stands, another thing when he sits, one thing in the morning, another in the evening, yea, one thing when sober, another when drunk?"

* Ficker, *ut supra*, p. xxiv.

The Preface closes by saying that this evil must not be met by violence and by arms, but by wise counsel, and by that benignity for which the Austrian Princes have been distinguished, for in this way the Princes who, in their blindness and ignorance, have favored Luther's doctrines, may be induced to drop him, and to force their people to come back to the light of the pristine and true Gospel.

With such an abundance of materials in hand, the work of composition moved on apace. At first the work was parted out among the individual members of the committee. But it was soon discovered that this method of procedure would fail to bring the desired unity. Thereupon it was resolved to place the composition in the hands of one man. For this work John Eck was unanimously chosen by the theologians present. He himself says: "I prepared the reply to the Saxon Confession." * Twice a day the committee met and revised his work; and Campeggius, who was confined to his quarters with the gout, kept his eye on the work and hastened it to a conclusion. On July 9th the Reply was finished in draft. The re-writing began the next day, and the committee promised that in three days it should be ready for delivery.

But meanwhile the Emperor, through the Count Palatine and others, inquired of the Protestant Princes whether they had additional articles to present, or would rest their cause with those which had been already proposed. The Princes consulted their theologians, and replied the next day that they had presented the most important articles of doctrine, and had condemned the abuses which conflicted with that doctrine; that it was not necessary nor possible to enumerate all the abuses which existed. They pray the Emperor to make haste, as they had been on expense for a long time, but, God willing, there shall be no failure on their side.†

This answer, though somewhat ambiguous, pleased the Emperor, and the Catholic Reply to the Protestant Confession was finished on the 12th. The next day, July 13th, it was delivered to the Emperor, together with a pile of books and pamphlets, for which he had not called, but which were intended to support the Reply and to influence his decision.‡ In all, there were 351

* Ficker, *ut supra*, p. XXXII., note 2. C. R., XXVII., 24, note.

† C. R. II., 184, 185.

‡ The title of the Reply was as follows: Catholica et quasi extemporanea responsio super nonnullis articulis Cæsareæ Majestati hisce proximis diebus in Dieta Imperiali Augustensi per Illustrissimos Electorem Saxoniae et

folia. The Emperor received them graciously, and when the theologians departed he extended to each one three fingers of his right hand. But the result was entirely different from what they had expected. The prolixity of the Reply, the accusations and calumnies which it contained, so displeased the Emperor that he remanded it back to the committee with instructions to reduce it in size, to make it more temperate, and to confine it to the matters that were contained in the Protestant Confession. A revision was speedily made by Cochlaeus, but this was not delivered to the Emperor. Then a second revision was made. This also failed to please the Emperor. Consequently he ordered another revision and commanded the omission of all remaining accusations of the Protestants. This further revised form was presented July 30th* or 31st, but, quite contrary to the expectation of the committee, it also was rejected. Another revision was ordered, with instructions to omit everything that could offend the Lutherans, to translate the Latin into German, and to present it within two days. This, the fifth form, was accepted by the Emperor and the Catholic Princes, and was ordered to be read publicly in the German language as the Emperor's reply to the Augsburg Confession.† Accordingly, August 3d, in the afternoon, it was read in German by Alexander Schweiss, one of the imperial secretaries, in the room in which just forty days

alios quosdam Principes et duas civitates oblatis. Folia 106. The other documents handed to the Emperor at the same time bore the following titles:

Antilogiarum, hoc est contradictionum Martini Lutheri Babilonia, ex eius Apostatae libris per D. Joannem Fabri excerpta. folia 36.

Hereses et errores ex diversis Martini libris in unum collecti. folia 61.

Hereses Sacris Conciliis antea damnatae per Lutheranos iterum ab inferis reductae. folia 14.

Hereses et errores Martini Lutheri per Leonem ante decennium condemnati folia 4.

Hereses et errores Martini Lutheri ante septennium per Universitatem Parisiensem condemnati folia 12.

Condemnatio facultatis theologiae Lovaniensis folia 2.

Epitome aliquot heresiarum et errorum Martini Lutheri folia 12.

Monstra sectarum ex Luthero et Lutheranis enata folia 12.

Lutherani Evangelii abominabiles nimiumque pernitiosi damnatissimi. fructus folia 12.

Christenliche darzue in ganz kurzer zeit gemacht und gegebne antwurt uber etlich artickel, so der Romischer Kayserlichen Majestat diss nechst verschinnen tags auf gemaines reichs versamlung zu Augsburg durch dy Durchleuchtigsten Durchleuchtigen Hochgebornen Churfursten von Saxen und etlich andere fursten auch zwayen Steeten fur gebracht und uberantwurt worden sein folia 80. Ficker, XLIX.

* Laemmer makes the date July 30th; *ut supra*, p. 156. C. R. XXVII., 31, names July 31st.

† Laemmer, *ut supra*, pp. 158-160. Pastor, *Die Kirchl. Reunionsbestr.*, p. 42. C. R. XXVII., 21-23. Francke, *Libri Symbolici*, XXX-XXXII.

before, less one, to the very hour, the Protestants had read their Confession. The German is, therefore, the official form of the Confutation, though the Latin has been far more generally used.

After the reading, which lasted two hours, the Emperor signified through the Elector Frederick that he considered the Confutation Christian, and entirely incapable of being refuted. It was therefore his Majesty's most gracious will that the Elector of Saxony and his associates in religion should subscribe to it as the Catholic and sacrosanct faith, and should return to the bosom of the Church, which he confidently hoped they would do. Should they do this, there was nothing that they might not expect at his hands. Should they refuse, then he must act as it became the guardian and protector of the Church.*

To this the Elector of Saxony and his co-religionists responded that, so far as they could learn from the hasty reading of the Confutation, an attempt had been made to refute their Confession by the testimony of the Scriptures and by quotations from the Fathers and the Councils. In a matter pertaining to the salvation of their souls they ought to have a copy of the Confutation, that they might examine it and see whether they had been refuted or not; and this, they remind the Emperor, is in harmony with the declaration of his Proclamation that the views of both parties should be heard and considered. The Emperor replied that he would take the matter into consideration. After two days he replied that they might have a copy on the conditions that they would not publish it nor allow it to be copied, and would not make reply to it, since now both parties had spoken and written.† As the Protestants could not accept it under these conditions, it was not delivered to them. Here the matter stood for the time being.

3. *The Contents of the Confutation.*

Of the first form of the Confutation, only recently brought to light, and published in 1891 by Ficker, it may be said that in the long preface it discusses the following points:

1. There are some articles in the Protestant Confession that agree with the teaching of the Church. The Princes should be exhorted to persevere in this doctrine, and on no account to depart from it.

* Chytraeus, *Historia Augsb. Conf.*, p. 213. Salig, *Historie*, I., pp. 274-6. Sleidan, *De Statu Religionis*, p. 107*b*. Epilogue to the Confutation.

† C. R. II., 253, 254. Chytraeus, *ut supra*, 215, 216. Laemmer, *ut supra*, pp. 160, 161.

2. The Confession contains some articles in regard to which the preachers for a decade have been preaching to the people the very opposite, and thereby have been creating doubt among the people. Such books should be destroyed.

3. The Confession contains numerous articles that agree neither with the Scriptures nor with the teaching of the Church. The Emperor should advise the Princes to depart from such errors and heresies and to disallow schism.

4. Besides these manifestly erroneous articles, Luther is the prime author of many heresies which have been examined in the councils and condemned. The Princes and their preachers should desist from these heresies.

5. Besides the innumerable errors of which Luther is the author, wicked and intolerable sects have sprung up, such as the Capernians, who oppose the Eucharist, and the Anabaptists, who oppose the baptism of children. The Emperor should proceed to exterminate these abominable heresies. The Princes should not tolerate these sects in their lands, nor give place to new ones.

The Confutation next proceeds to discuss the Confession, article by article. Sometimes the article is quoted in full, and sometimes only in part. Quite generally the thesis and the antithesis of the doctrinal articles are approved. But in every case the authors proceed to arraign the theologians of the Princes and to condemn their teaching. In some instances the discussions are elaborate, and consist, on the one hand, of condemnations of the Lutheran teaching in general and in particular, and on the other hand, of exhibitions of the teaching of the Catholic Church on the article in question. Here there is no lack of learning. The Canon Law, the decrees of councils, the dicta of the Fathers, are handled with great familiarity. But the style is pedantic and the tone is dictatorial, and instead of argument we find abuse and vilification. In a word, the Confutation in this its first form can scarcely be regarded as a reply to the Confession, but much rather as an assailment of Luther and the Lutherans. But it is valuable in that it furnishes a consensus of Roman Catholic teaching at that time, and exhibits the mind and heart of Dr. John Eck, its chief author.

When the Confutation passes to the second part of the Confession it finds nothing to approve in regard to the abuses that have been corrected, but it defends the rites and ceremonies of the Catholic Church with vehemence, and with passionate declamation against Luther and the Lutherans—a piece of private

polemic, and not a dignified reply to an official document. Had it been read before the Diet as the Emperor's reply to the Protestant Confession, it would have exasperated the minds of the Protestant Princes and aggravated the situation. Happily, it was rejected by the Emperor and was allowed to be buried in oblivion for more than three hundred and fifty years.

Turning now to the Confutation as it was read, August 3d, we find an entirely different document. Not only does this official Confutation differ from the first in length, but in tone and in contents. The treatment is almost entirely objective. There is but little controversy with Luther and the preachers. Quotations from the Fathers and from the official teaching of the Church are comparatively rare. In form it is dignified and respectful; in argument it is poor and weak. It may be called a *criticism,* an arraignment, of the Confession. It cannot be regarded as a *confutation* of the Confession. It is doubtful if it satisfied its composers. It is certain that it made no formidable impression on the Protestants. Cochlaeus says: "While it (the Confutation) was being read in German by Alexander, one of the imperial secretaries, at a public session of the Emperor and the Princes, many of the Lutherans impertinently laughed; others took exception to passages of Scripture quoted in the document, and afterwards censured." * Brentz wrote to Isenmann, August 4th: "The entire document smacks of Cochlaeus, Fabri and Eck. It is absolutely stupid, so that I am ashamed of the Roman name, because they do not seek out men who can reply to us heretics in a prudent and decorous way." † Melanchthon to Luther, August 6th: "Since the Confutation is so utterly puerile, there was great rejoicing after the reading."‡ And to Myconius, August 8th: "Believe me, when the Confutation was read many good men felt greatly encouraged, since they have learned that our opponents have absolutely no knowledge of Christ." §

Forty-three years after the reading, the Confutation appeared in print for the first time, under the title: *Caroli Cæsaris et Catholicorum Principum ad oblatam a Protestantibus Confessionem responsio,*|| that is, Reply of the Emperor Charles and of

* Com. de Actis et Scriptis Lutheri, p. 209. See Pastor, *ut supra,* p. 43.
† C. R. II., 245.
‡ C. R. II., 253.
§ C. R. II., 260.
|| In *Harmonia Confessionis Augustanae.* By Andreas Fabricius Leodius. Colonae, 1573.

the Catholic Princes to the Confession presented by the Protestants. The word "Confutation" is not a part of the official title. Indeed, that word seems to have been first used in this connection by the Lutherans, though Charles, in giving orders for the publication of the Reply *—orders which were not executed—employed the word "confutavimus." †

In length it corresponds very well to the Augsburg Confession. In print it covers about thirty pages. It consists of Prologue-Epilogue, Part I. and Part II. But as it is quite too long to appear in full in these pages, we give the summary of it made by Cochlaeus and published at Dresden in the year 1531.‡

4. *Summary of the Imperial Reply to the Confession of the five Princes and six cities at the Diet lately held in Augsburg.*§

The first Article, *Of the Holy Trinity,* is wholly approved in all points.

The second, *Of Original Sin,* is approved in part, namely, in that original sin is truly sin, etc.; in part not, namely, in that they say that original sin is to be without the fear of God, and without trust in God, and it is concupiscence, which remains in children after baptism.

The third, *Of the Two Natures of Christ,* that he is true God and Man, is approved in all parts.

The fourth, *Of the Merit of Good Works,* is approved in that we by our own powers can merit nothing. And therefore the Pelagians are justly condemned as heretics. But it is rejected in that they do not confess with us the merit of good works which are done by means of divine grace.

The fifth, *Of the Word and Sacraments,* is approved, in that by these, as by an instrument, the Holy Spirit is given. But it is rejected in so far as they speak of faith alone, and say nothing about love and hope.

The sixth, *Of Good Works,* is approved, in that faith ought to produce good works, and is rejected in that they say that faith alone justifies, in regard to which they do not correctly understand the words of Christ, Luke 17, of Paul and Ambrose on Romans 3, 4, etc.

* Laemmer, *ut supra,* pp. 161, 162.
† Ficker, *ut supra,* p. 153.
‡ C. R. XXVII., 70.
§ C. R. XXVII., 240-244. Also Walch, *Opera Lutheri,* XVI., 1274-1279. In St. Louis Edition of Luther's Works, XVI., 1069-1073.

The seventh, *Of the Church,* is rejected, where they mean to have it understood that only the congregation of the saints is the Church, for in the Church good and bad are congregated. But it is approved in that the Church abides forever.

The eighth, *Of Ministers of the Church,* that even the wicked may preach and may administer the sacraments, is approved in all parts.

The ninth, *Of Baptism,* is also wholly approved, that children should be baptized, and that the Anabaptists should not be approved.

The tenth, *Of the Venerable Sacrament of the Altar,* is also approved, yet with this addition, that it should be steadfastly believed that the whole Christ is under each form of the sacrament, and that the substance of the bread is truly changed into the body of Christ.

The eleventh, *Of Confession,* is also approved, with the requisition of two things. First, that confession should be made at Easter time, according to the chapter: "Every one of both sexes." Secondly, that each one should be careful to confess all sins of which he knows himself to be guilty, and should not purposely conceal any.

The twelfth, *Of Penance,* is approved, in that sin may be forgiven the sinner, if he repents, so often as he sins. But it is rejected, first, in that it presents not more than two parts of penance; secondly, in that they say that faith is a part of penance; thirdly, in that it does not confess satisfaction, the third part of penance.

The thirteenth, *Of the Use of the Sacraments,* is wholly approved, namely, that the sacraments are not only signs among men, but also witnesses of the divine will towards us.

The fourteenth, *Of the Clerical Estate,* is approved, namely, that no one should preach or administer the sacraments, unless he has been properly called, with this addition, that such call should be made according to the ancient order of the Christian Church, not when the choice is made by the civil authority or by the people, but when the Bishop, or he whose duty it is according to law and custom, calls or institutes.

The fifteenth, *Of Ceremonies in the Churches,* is also approved, in that they should be observed, in so far as they can be observed without sin. But it is rejected in that they say that such ceremonies are contrary to the Gospel, if they are performed to reconcile God, or for sin.

The sixteenth, *Of Civil Government,* is wholly approved, with the condemnation of the Anabaptists, who wish to tolerate no civil government among Christians.

The seventeenth, *Of the Final Judgment,* is also wholly approved, with the rejection of the Anabaptists and others who would concede redemption and salvation finally to the devils and the ungodly.

The eighteenth, *Of Free-will,* is also approved, namely, that we have free-will in human affairs: but in divine affairs we can do nothing without the grace of God.

The nineteenth, *Of the Cause of Sin,* is also approved, namely, that not God, but the will of man is the cause of sin.

The twentieth, *Of Good Works,* is rejected. For they will not confess that by good works one may acquire the remission of sin.

The twenty-first, *Of Honoring and Worshiping the Saints,* is also rejected, because they confess the error of the Vigilants, the Waldensians, the Picards and others, and will not invoke the saints. In this they act contrary to the Scriptures of both Testaments, and to all teachers, etc.

End of the Articles.

The Second Part of the Confession of the Princes. Of Abuses.

In this part no article is approved, for what they call an abuse is not an abuse.

Of Both Forms of the Sacrament.

From the Scriptures and the Holy Fathers it is proved that under one form, namely, that of the bread, it has always been the custom to receive this sacrament after the Mass, and much more is it an abuse to administer both forms to the laity, contrary to the order of the Church and without the command of God.

Of the Marriage of Priests and Monks.

Here also it is proved from the Scriptures, from the ancient Fathers and from many councils that not the purity of the priests, but much rather the unchaste marriage of the monks and pastors is an intolerable abuse, for, more than eleven hundred years ago, this thing was condemned in the heresy of Jovinian, and all their arguments were answered and refuted on the sure foundation of the Scripture.

Of the Mass.

First: That they, contrary to the usage of the universal Church, hold the Mass in German, is rejected. Secondly: That they regard it as an abuse that he who serves at the altar should live from the altar, because the Scripture permits this. Luke 10 and 1 Cor. 9, etc. Thirdly: That they, from wantonness, contrary to the honor of God and the last wills of the founders, have abolished so many of the endowed masses. Fourthly: That they renounce the sacrifice of the Mass, which is (as shown by Augustine) an old heresy of the Arians, and the sacrifice of the Mass is proved by many passages of the Scriptures, and from the most ancient teachers and councils. Therefore the Mass is by no means to be abolished.

Of Confession.

First: It is regarded as an abuse in Luther's sect that so few people confess. Secondly: That they say nothing about penitence and satisfaction for sin. Thirdly: That they misunderstand and misinterpret the words of Chrysostom in regard to oral confession. Fourthly: That they do not confess all secret sins of which they are conscious, which is an old heresy of the Montanists, who are ashamed to confess all sins.

Of the Distinction of Meats.

First: It is rejected that they, contrary to Christ, Luke 10, and to Paul, 1 Thess. 2, etc., despise a statute and a rule of the Church. Secondly: That they regard such a statute as unprofitable. Thirdly: That they say that it is contrary to faith, contrary to the Gospel, contrary to the commandments of God. Fourthly: That they regard it as impossible. Fifthly: That by such institutions they misunderstand Christ and Paul. Sixthly: That they would have all such things free and unforbidden.

Of Monastic Vows.

First. It is rejected that they, contrary to so many passages of both Testaments, would abolish such vows. Secondly: That they regard the monastic life as improper, contrary to so many thousands of holy people, who from the beginning of Christianity to our day have lived and been happy in such a life. Thirdly: That they, contrary to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, would have such vows to be voluntary. Fourthly: That

they say that such vows are impossible, contrary to so much Scripture and to the promise of Christ. Fifthly: That they say that monks and nuns should not be divorced. Sixthly: That they say that such a life is contrary to the Gospel, whereas it is in harmony with the Gospel, and it forsakes father and mother, house and home, for the sake of Christ, according to his counsel, Matt. 19, Luke 9 and 14, etc.

Of Ecclesiastical Power.

First: It is rejected that they wish to abolish the jurisdiction, the authority, the franchises, the privileges of the clergy, which have come to them from emperors and kings. Secondly: That they, contrary to the Scriptures, do not concede the authority of the clergy, and suppress their jurisdiction. Thirdly: That, contrary to the Scriptures and to the imperial laws, they despise the liberty of those who have taken orders. Fourthly: That they wish to subject the ministry to civil tribunals, which is contrary to the Scriptures and to imperial laws. Fifthly: That, contrary to the command of the Church, they allege a wanton liberty, which we are under no obligation to observe. Sixthly: That they, on account of abuses, wish to fling away also good ordinances of the clergy. Finally the Imperial Majesty wishes that they return to Christian unity and help to correct all abuses. Amen.*

* Besides this Epitome of the Confutation made by Cochlaeus, we have one made by Camerarius and some other Lutherans while the Confutation was being read, and another, made at the same time, by someone who was in the retinue of the Margrave of Brandenburg. The former of these is found in Volume IX., pp. 421-423 of the Wittenberg edition of Luther's Works. The latter is found in Chytraeus' *History*, pp. 119-125. Both have been reproduced in *Corpus Reformatorum*, Vol. XXVII., 227 *et seqq.* These furnished the basis of Melanchthon's *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* as it appeared in its first form.

CHAPTER X.

EFFORTS AT RECONCILIATION.

The Augsburg Confession was written, signed and delivered with the avowed purpose of repelling hostile attacks and of expressing agreement in doctrine with the Roman Church. Neither the theologians nor the Princes had any intention of leaving the Catholic Church, but much rather was it their intention, by repudiating heresy and by affirming the Catholic doctrine, to vindicate their right to remain in that Church. This attitude of mind accounts for the mild and conciliatory character of the Confession, which declares that it contains no doctrine that differs from the Roman Church in so far as it is known from writers. Already before the completion and signing of the Confession Melanchthon had been invited several times to interviews with Alphonso Valdesius, one of the imperial secretaries, for the purpose of discussing the affairs of the Lutherans, and of ascertaining what the Lutherans desired and of inquiring how assistance could be rendered. Melanchthon declared that the matter was not so tedious and clumsy as it had been reported to the Emperor, and that the dissidence related chiefly to both forms of the sacrament, to the marriage of priests and monks, and to the Mass, as the Lutherans did not approve private Masses.* We also learn at the same time that the Emperor desired to have the matter settled quietly, and not to have an open discussion, inasmuch as an open discussion would only promote anger and discord.† On the 24th of June Brentz wrote to Isenmann that the Confession had been drawn up "very politely and moderately. In it the Princes seek to settle the controversy amicably, and to restore peace." ‡

Thus we see that already before the reading of the Confession the atmosphere was charged with a desire for peace, though the Protestant Princes "stood fast in the confession of the Gospel." The day after the reading and delivery of the Confession, Melanchthon, in a letter to Luther, expressed the opinion that the

* C. R. II., 122. Whether Melanchthon or the Catholics took the initiative in these interviews remains a question.

† C. R. II., 123.

‡ C. R. II., 124-5.

future discussion would be limited to both species in the Eucharist, to marriage and to private Masses.* A day later he thinks that the chief controversy will be in regard to private Masses, and inquires of Luther: "How much can we concede to the enemy?" † July 4th, Osiander wrote to friends that the Emperor's confessor had approved the Lutherans, and bade them be of good courage, and adds: "In a word, there is no one who does not desire that this matter be settled on just and Christian conditions, except certain petty German Bishops, petty tyrants and pseudo-theologasters, who, beset by the furies, really desire nothing but blood. If they do not repent, may God reward them according to their works." ‡ On the sixth of July, Melanchthon, under instruction from the Protestant Princes, wrote a letter to Cardinal Campeggius, in which, after praising the Cardinal's moderation, he urges him to take the lead in restoring harmony. He declares that the Protestant Princes very much desire peace; "for they see that if any disturbance should arise there is danger that there may be greater confusion in regard to religion and the Church. Therefore they pray that your Most Reverend Lordship shall not suffer itself to be deflected from this supreme moderation, but take care that peace be restored, which at such a time seems to be profitable for the entire realm, especially since they suffer no doctrines to be taught which differ from the Scriptures and from the Church. In turn they privately offer their service to your Most Reverend Lordship, and promise publicly that in so far as it can be done without wounding their consciences, they will accept such conditions as will promote peace and concord, and as will tend to retain, confirm and establish the ecclesiastical order; and they declare that they by no means wish the ecclesiastical order and the lawful authority of the Bishops to collapse." § Immediately after the delivery of the Confession the Emperor had written to Rome that a good beginning had been made for the restoration of peace, and in later letters he seems to have expressed similar hopes. On the sixth of July his confessor wrote him:

* C. R. II., 141.
† C. R. II., 146.
‡ C. R. II., 163.
§ C. R. II., 171. See also Melanchthon's letter to Cardinal Campeggius in C. R. II., 168 *et seqq.*, in which, among other things, he says: "We hold no doctrine different from the Roman Church. . . . For no other reason do we bear much odium in Germany than because we with the greatest constancy defend the doctrines of the Roman Church. Such fidelity to Christ and to the Roman Church we will, please God, show to the last breath."

"It appears that God is working wonders through your Reverend Majesty, and after the beginning of the healing of this disorder, it is evident that we may hope that the end will be much more favorable than our sins deserve." * And the personal relations between the parties were most friendly. July 17th, King Ferdinand invited the Elector of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Margrave of Brandenburg and others of their party to a dance, "since they also are very good fellows." †

When the Lutherans had declined to receive a copy of the Confutation on the conditions made by the Emperor, at once the Electors of Mayence and Brandenburg, the Dukes of Brunswick and Saxony, came to the Elector John of Saxony and offered themselves as mediators between the Protestants and the Emperor; whereupon the Elector of Saxony exclaimed: "It is not that we have a breach with the Emperor. He summoned this Diet for the very purpose that we might be one in regard to the faith, and for this we are entirely ready." ‡ And at the same time the same Catholic Princes presented themselves most humbly before the Emperor and begged to be appointed mediators between the parties. The Emperor was pleased with their proposition.

Thus we see that on both sides the desire for peace and harmony in the faith was strong, and, we may believe, equally sincere on both sides. The Protestants could not brook the idea of leaving the Catholic Church, nor that of being thrust out of it. The Catholics knew full well what it meant to the Catholic Church to have the Protestant Princes and their peoples separated from that Church. There is no doubt that both parties felt the awful power of the old dogma "that there is no salvation out of the Church." Hence the strong desire and the many efforts for *rapprochement.*

1. *The Committee of Sixteen.*

In compliance with the request of the Catholic Princes noted above, a committee of sixteen persons was appointed August 6th. It consisted of the Elector of Mayence, the Elector Joachim

* Pastor, *Reunionsbestrebungen,* p. 42.

† *Ibid.,* p. 43. Besides theological disputations at Augsburg, we read of banquets, where Lutherans and Catholics feasted together, of jousts and tournaments. In one of these, King Ferdinand was thrown from his horse three times and was hurt. Six persons were killed in one day. C. R. II., 355. Lindsay, *History of the Reformation,* p. 371, *note.*

‡ Pfaff, *Geschichte,* I., p. 308. Plitt, *Apologie der Augustana,* p. 45. *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1900, pp. 368 *et seqq.* C. R. II., 254.

of Brandenburg, who was made spokesman, Duke Henry of Brunswick, Duke George of Saxony, the Archbishop of Saltzburg, the Bishop of Worms, the Bishop of Strassburg, the Bishop of Augsburg, Duke Albert of Mecklenburg, the Abbot of Weingarten, Count Martin of Ottingen, George Truchsess, and the delegates respectively of Treves, Cologne, Baden and the Palatinate.

The Committee held a meeting in the forenoon of the day of its appointment, and consumed most of the time in listening to violent disputes between its own members, especially between the Bishop of Augsburg and the Archbishop of Saltzburg. The former opened the session with an address in which he admonished the Committee to do nothing contrary to God's Word, to right and justice, since the Lutherans had not attempted to overthrow a single doctrine of the Christian faith. Hence every effort should be made to restore and to establish the former peace and concord of the Church. The Archbishop of Saltzburg demanded to know why the Bishop of Augsburg had so suddenly changed his opinion, since he had recently heard him speak very differently. The Bishop of Augsburg replied that he had done many things in his life-time which were wrong, but the time and the occasion demand a change. He charged the Archbishop with palliating idolatrous abuses and defending impious doctrines, and prays God to be restrained from such impiety. Then Joachim of Brandenburg turned upon the Bishop of Augsburg and denied the truthfulness of his statement that the Lutherans had opposed no article of faith, affirming that the Lutherans had denied and rejected the Catholic Church and the worship of the saints. Finally the Archbishop of Mayence, disgusted with such altercations and disputes, begged that they should make an end to disputing, and turn their attention to the abolition of abuses and to the restoration of peace throughout the Roman Empire.*

So passed the morning session. The afternoon session was even worse and more violent. The Catholic Princes heaped reproaches upon each other and charged each other with lying, and scarcely abstained from blows.† Consequently, nothing was done that day to promote the interests of peace.

The next day, August 7th, leading members of the Committee

* See Coelestin, *Historia,* III., 25, 26. Chytraeus, *Historie,* p. 215. J. J. Müller, pp. 706-709. Schirrmacher, p. 191. Salig, *Vollständige Historie,* I., 277.

† *Ut supra.*

held an interview with the Protestant Princes and demanded that they should abandon their false doctrine and return to the Church. The Elector of Saxony asked for time to deliberate. Thereupon the violent Elector Joachim of Brandenburg turned upon him and declared that unless he should abandon the teaching of Luther, the Emperor would proceed against him with arms and would subjugate him and take away his rank, his possessions, his life, and would bring his subjects, with their wives and children, back to the old faith.*

Coelestin tells us that this harsh and violent speech frightened the Elector of Saxony almost as though he had been stunned by a thunderbolt, and that, returning home, he could not conceal his alarm from his theologians, but told them that unless he should abjure and renounce the known truth of the Gospel he would be attacked by force, and that both he and his subjects would be brought to extreme peril and distress.†

In the afternoon of the same day Chancellor Brück and a special committee prepared an answer to the demands of the Catholic Princes.‡ They complain that their cause has not been properly heard, as had been promised in the Imperial Proclamation of the Diet; that a copy of the Confutation had not been given them. They declare that they cannot conscientiously approve the propositions made by the Catholic party, and they note the fact that the Emperor had time and again promised to call a council to discuss these matters.§ This answer was read before the Catholic Committee by Chancellor Brück on the afternoon of the ninth of August, and was subscribed by eight Princes and six cities, Kempten, Winsheim, Heilbronn and Weissenburg having now accepted the Augsburg Confession.

On the eleventh the Catholic Committee made reply to the Protestant answer through the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg. We have not the full text of this reply, but only so much of it as some of the Protestants took down *volante calamo* at the time. Its substance is as follows:

First. The Protestants complain that the Emperor has not redeemed the promise made in his Proclamation, that the views of both parties should be heard and considered. This is a false

* Coelestin, III., 26. J. J. Müller, *ut supra,* pp. 714, 715. Salig, *ut supra,* I., 279.

† Coelestin, III., 26*b*.

‡ C. R. II., 266.

§ This answer of the Protestant Princes is found in Latin in Chytraeus, pp. 221 *et seqq.;* in J. J. Müller, pp. 716 *et seqq.;* in Walch, XVI., 1632 *et seqq.*

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

accusation, since the Emperor has more than fulfilled his promise, and has even inquired whether the Protestants had anything more to present.

Secondly. The Confutation was not given them for good and sufficient reasons, since the Imperial Laws forbid, on peril of body and life, to dispute and to wrangle about the Articles of Faith. The Imperial Edicts about matters of the faith had not been observed by the Protestants, but had been treated with mockery and insult. So it would go with the Confutation. If the Protestants would observe the conditions, it would be given to them, or it should be read as often as they desired.

Thirdly. As regards conscience, the Protestants appeal to their consciences when matters of conscience are not involved, and where they ought to have consciences they have none, since their preachers, contrary to the Holy Scriptures and to the Christian Church, have made unchristian laws and ordinances, have deceived the common people, and have everywhere tolerated the sects, as the Iconoclasts, the Sacramentarians, the Anabaptists and others. Their consciences should teach them that they ought much rather follow the Catholic Church than its seducers.

Fourthly. A free council has indeed been promised, but on account of wars in Germany and in Italy it could not be held. Should a council be held, whether sooner or later, but little good can be expected, for the Lutherans have accused the old councils of errors. A council would only give occasion for derision and insult. For the present it were better to propose means and ways for concord.* Two days later, that is, August 13th, the Protestant Princes make a very long reply to the latest reply of the Catholic Committee. At first it was delivered *viva voce* by Dr. Brück, but then, on account of its very great importance as involving soul and honor and possessions, it was committed to writing and formally read to the Committee.† We can give only the substance:

1. They (the Protestants) cannot deny that the Emperor had heard their Confession as was promised in the Proclamation. But the point of the Proclamation is that the views and opinions of both parties should be considered in love and kindness, so that what is not right on both sides might be put away. This had not yet been done, for it had only been insisted that the

* Original in Walch, XVI., pp. 1635-1637; St. Louis Edition of Luther's *Schriften*, XVI., 1352-1355; J. J. Müller, 722, *et seqq.;* Latin in Chytraeus, *Historia*, 222 *et seqq.* See Salig, I., 281-2.

† C. R. II., 279; Salig, I., 282; Schirrmacher, p. 519.

Lutherans should abandon their views and condemn their doctrine, before the views of their opponents should be condemned.

2. What had been said in regard to the Confutation they could not approve. They had not ridiculed nor given occasion for ridiculing the Imperial Edicts. They could not discover that they were forbidden by the Imperial Laws to dispute on the faith. They knew how far matters of faith could be discussed, and how far not. It is not forbidden by the laws to confess the Christian faith, and in a Christian and charitable way to point out and to abolish abuses. Inasmuch as the Catholic doctors had the Confession in hand so many weeks, how could it be expected that the Lutherans should be satisfied with the mere reading of the Confutation?

3. As regards their consciences they confess that they are men and sinners, but by the grace of God they have more peaceful consciences than some who had persecuted the doctrine, driven away the preachers, and had not given place to the truth. They had reposed their consciences, not upon their preachers, but upon the truth of God's Word; and they had never turned from the unity of the Empire and of the Church, but by admission of the Word of God they had promoted it.

4. They had nothing in common with the sects. But so many abuses have been taught that they can no longer be borne. Had the Bishops been careful, unity could have been maintained. At the Nürnberg Diet, Pope Adrian confessed that all these grievances had proceeded from the Roman court and from other prelates. In their Confession they had said nothing about many abuses in the Roman Church.

5. As regards their preachers, they knowingly tolerate no immoral preachers. But it is well known that on the other side ministers live with harlots, say the Mass frivolously, and practice simony.

6. They are still ready, so far as is consistent with God's Word, to maintain the authority of the Bishops, and in everything to unite with others, in so far as their consciences will permit.

7. That in appealing to a council, they seek nothing contrary to law, but rather do they evince their obedience, because a council is the regular way of treating such matters. Should other feasible ways be proposed for the settlement of the alienation, their approval will not be wanting. They thought that it would be more in harmony with the Emperor's Proclamation for both

sides to choose an equal, but small, number of men who would treat with each other on the articles in dispute, and aim to bring about an agreement. On their part, they were ready to do all that could be done with a good conscience.*

We thus learn that the Catholic Committee was harsh, minatory and denunciative. The Protestant Princes were firm, moderate, conciliatory. Both parties desired unity. The Committee demanded the unconditional surrender of the Protestants to the Catholic Church. The Protestants demanded the abatement of well-known abuses, and sought to effect unity by conferences and by mutual concessions. But the proposition of the Protestants for the appointment of a smaller committee, to be composed of an equal number of representatives from each side, was so evidently wise and just, that it was approved the next day by the Emperor and his counsellors.†

2. *The Committee of Fourteen.*

The following day, August 15th, "a committee of fourteen persons was ordered by His Majesty, seven from each side, who should consult together and should treat of the matters pertaining to God's Word and to the faith, and should consider in a friendly manner how the difference in faith could be removed." ‡ The Committee was to consist of one Prince, one Bishop or clerical Prelate, two jurists and three theologians from each side. The Committee, as actually constituted, consisted of two Princes, two jurists and three theologians from each side, as follows:

From the Catholic Side.

Duke Henry of Brunswick.
The Bishop of Augsburg.
The Chancellor of Cologne.
The Chancellor of Baden.
Dr. John Eck, Theologian of the Duke of Bavaria.
Dr. Conrad Wimpina, Theologian of Elector Joachim.
Dr. John Cochlaeus, Theologian of Duke George of Saxony.§

* Answer in Chytraeus (German), 130 *et seqq.;* J. J. Müller, pp. 727-741; Walch, XVI., 1637 *et seqq.;* Chytraeus (Latin), 225 *et seqq.* See Salig, I., 282-4.

† Schirrmacher, pp. 211, 520; Chytraeus, p. 232.

‡ We have here combined the accounts found in Spalatin's *Annales,* pp. 152, 153, and in Schirrmacher, pp. 211, 212, 521. See J. J. Müller, pp. 742-3.

§ Duke Henry of Brunswick served on the Committee for a very few days, but when he was sent in pursuit of the Landgrave of Hesse, who had

From the Side of the Protestants.

Duke John Frederick of Saxony.
Margrave George of Brandenburg.
Dr. Gregory Brück, Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony.
Dr. Sebastian Heller, Chancellor of Margrave George.
Master Philip Melanchthon, Saxon theologian.
John Brentz, Theologian of Margrave George.
Erhard Schnepf, Hessian theologian.*

The Committee held its first meeting on the afternoon of August 16th. But already two days earlier the Archbishop of Mayence, Duke George, and others, had commissioned Dr. John Eck to prepare an opinion on all the articles of the Augsburg Confession.

In the execution of his commission, Eck followed in general the Confutation of August 3d. He approved the following articles as agreeing with the teaching of the Church: 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19. The following articles he regarded as differing in part from the teaching of the Church: 2, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15. The following, he declares, differ from the teaching of the Church: 7, 20, 21.†

He declares that all the articles of Part II. of the Confession differ from the teaching of the Church. He then says: "In a word, articles difficult of reconciliation, and not acceptable to the Church, are:

"Of the Worship of the Saints.
"Of Communion of both Kinds.
"Of the Marriage of Priests.
"Of Monastic Vows.
"Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.
"Of Human Institutions.

"I think all the difficulty lies in these six points. Whatever difficulty there is in the other articles can be easily settled and removed by a committee of two Princes and two learned men from each side." ‡

left Augsburg, August 6th, "without the knowledge, will and permission of the Emperor" (Pastor, p. 44; Schirrmacher, p. 189; C. R., II., 291), Duke George was appointed in his place.

* Schirrmacher, pp. 111, 112; Chytraeus (Latin), p. 238; J. J. Müller, *Historie*, pp. 742, 743; C. R. II., 311, 312. See *The Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1900, pp. 374 *et seqq.*

† Eck wrote this opinion August 14th. Chytraeus (Latin), p. 232; Wiedemann's *Dr. Johann Eck*, p. 593. Of Article X. he says: "Articulus X. concordat de veritate eucharistiae, non tamen rapiatur ad utramque speciem."

‡ The *Opinion*, in its full text, in Chytraeus (Latin), pp. 232 *et seqq.*

And on August 15th, the Protestant theologians presented to the Protestant Princes an *Opinion* on the subject of concord. Very justly does Plitt say that "this *Opinion* sounds extraordinarily pacific."* It opens thus: "It is our humble opinion that the Princes ought to seek out all means and ways to preserve a permanent peace, and to prevent injury to the country and to the people. We cannot answer before God if we persist in an unnecessary schism. We observe that daily the people are becoming more wanton, that erring sects are increasing, and that—which may God forefend—war is threatened, which may overthrow both the Church and the Empire. Such important matters should be carefully considered.

"If the Princes have neglected the proper means, they are responsible for all slaughters, etc. They are negligent in regard to the blessings that may follow, viz., that the doctrine of justification, and the Gospel of Christ, may come to many millions of persons by whom Christ may be glorified.

"It is of the utmost importance that discipline be administered in Church and in school, lest the people become rude and heathenish. But now no proper discipline can be established or maintained while this schism lasts. It were better to become Jews, and to live under discipline, even though some practice evil, than to become heathenish and wild, since God preferred the Jews to the heathen.

"Therefore we most humbly pray the Princes, for God's sake and for their own welfare, to strive to make peace, and see to it that, should the enemy become too harsh, our consciences should become easier. God grant that the delinquency may not be with us."

Then, after further preliminary discussion, the theologians name four conditions, from which, they say, they cannot depart:

"1. That the doctrine of faith, works and Christian freedom, as it has hitherto existed among us, shall be preached according to the Confession.

"2. That both forms of the sacraments be given to the laity.

"3. That it be not required to restore Private Masses, as the opposing party has hitherto held them, making them an offering for the forgiveness of the sins of the living and the dead.

Coelestin, pp. 36-37. Schirrmacher, pp. 203 *et seqq.* German translation in the German Chytraeus, pp. 135 *et seqq.* English translation in *The Lutheran Quarterly* for July, 1900, pp. 383 *et seqq.* Already on the fourteenth of August, Eck had declared that "they did not want any Princes on the committee, for the Princes are self-conceited fools." C. R. II., 279.

* *Apologie,* p. 50.

"4. That marriage be left free to the priests and to other ministers."

To the Bishops they concede full jurisdiction in spiritual matters "as in affairs of marriage, and of the ban for the punishment of open sins, but not in matters pertaining to civil government." Of the Pope they say: "Though the Pope be Antichrist, yet we may be subject to him as the Jews were subject to Pharaoh in Egypt, and subsequently were subject to Caiaphas. But the pure doctrine must be allowed." They think that the matter of monasticism might be left free, and that the restoration of the episcopal jurisdiction might be made, so that the Bishops should ordain the priests, and should regulate the ceremonies, but only to the extent that they do not oppose or persecute the Lutheran doctrine, nor bind impious burdens upon anyone.*

Eck's *Opinion* and the *Opinion* of the Lutheran theologians formed the two foci towards which the discussions of the Committee centered, though there were numerous deflections from both sides, but in the direction of a steady approximation.

3. *The Meetings of the Committee.*

This Committee held its first session in the *Rathaus* on the afternoon of August 16th. Dr. Hieronymus Vehus, Chancellor of Baden, was appointed spokesman on the Catholic side, and Dr. Gregory Brück, chancellor on the Protestant side. George Spalatin was chosen to act as secretary. It was mutually agreed that the discussions should be conducted in an amicable manner; that the conclusions reached should be referred to the Emperor; that nothing should be considered that is contrary to the Word of God and to the teaching of the Church, and that the proceedings were not to be divulged except to those who are interested. The Augsburg Confession was made the basis of discussion.

These preliminaries having been determined, the debate began. Dr. John Eck and Philip Melanchthon were the chief de-

* Given in Schirrmacher, pp. 287 *et seqq.* In a somewhat fuller text in C. R. II., 281 *et seqq.* Spalatin's *Annales*, pp. 229 *et seqq.* Latin in Chytraeus, pp. 236 *et seqq.* Coelestin, III., 31 *et seqq.* Förstemann (who erroneously dates August 18th), II., 244 *et seqq.* On the margin opposite to the section about the Pope, Brück wrote with his own hand: "I am in doubt about this. Since we say that the Pope is Antichrist on account of his enormous sins, how can we with a good conscience reverence Antichrist and practice his abuses? If this be done, the Pope is not opposed to us. If we are subject to his human difference, even this does not make any difference. But he claims and defends the papacy *jure divino.*" C. R. II., 284, *margin.*

baters. Spalatin, the secretary, has left us a report of what ensued. No objection was made by the Catholics to the first article of the Confession. Eck complained that in the second article Melanchthon had employed unusual words, but he declared that in other respects the article was unobjectionable. There was perfect agreement in regard to the third article. The main contention that afternoon was over the fourth article, and particularly over the word *sola* in the formula, *faith alone saves.* Eck said that that word could not be tolerated. Brentz replied that it could not be surrendered, for it had been employed by Ambrose and Hilary, and was derived from Paul. Finally Eck said: "You confess that forgiveness of sin takes place by grace which makes acceptable, and by faith in a formal way, and by the Word and the sacraments in an instrumental way. The article is to be so stated."

Of Articles V., VI., VII., VIII., Eck said: "In foundation and in substance we are not divided." Spalatin reports further: "No objection was made to the ninth article, of Baptism. The tenth article, *de eucharistia,* of the venerable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, was not found wanting, except that the word *realiter* or *substantialiter,* or, in the German, *wesentlich,* should be added." *

Both Spalatin and Schirrmacher say that "in this first session they agreed on eleven articles of the Confession." The twelfth was under discussion when the session closed.

The next day, August 17th, the Committee was in session both in the forenoon and in the afternoon. As the result of deliberation, the parties agreed on fifteen out of the first twenty-one articles of the Confession. Three were held under dispute and three were reserved to be considered in connection with Part II. On the eighteenth the Lutherans made a Declaration of the articles on which the Committee had agreed:

"On the first article there is agreement.

* *Annales,* pp. 159 *et seqq.;* Müller, *Historie,* p. 752. Cochlaeus reports in his *Philippicae Quatuor,* H. 1*a,* thus: "The Lutherans of their own accord gave up and renounced this word *Sola,* and no longer said that we are justified by faith alone. Therefore, a brief statement of concord was then drawn up in the briefest possible form of words—and unless my memory fails me, it was written by Philip himself, namely, that justification or the remission of sins takes place per gratiam gratum facientem et fidem formaliter, per verbum vero et sacramentum instrumentaliter." Quoted from Plitt, *Apologie der Augustana,* p. 49. Melanchthon, in his account of this colloquy, says: "He (Eck) wanted us to write: *Quod justificamur per gratiam et fidem.* I made no objection; but that fool doesn't know the meaning of the word *grace.*" C. R. II., 300. "The *sola fide* was at least formally dropped." Möller's *Kirchengeschichte* (2d ed.), p. 102.

"When in the Latin it is said that man is by nature born without the fear of God and without faith in God, it is to be understood, not only that young children cannot have this power (Wirkung), but that, weakened by nature, they are unable by natural powers to have the fear of God and faith. And to be born without such power and gifts is a want of righteousness which we are understood to derive from Adam.

"In the German this point is so clear that it was not attacked, namely, that we are not able by nature to fear God and to believe. Adults are also included.

"Of natural lusts we hold that the sin of nature remains, but the guilt is removed by Baptism.

"On the third we are agreed.

"As an explanation of the fourth, fifth and sixth articles we confess that remission of sins takes place through grace, whereby we have a gracious God, and that in us it takes place through faith, and by the Word of God and the sacraments as instruments.*

"On the seventh article there is agreement.

"In the eighth article, Of the Church, we confess that in this life there are many wicked persons and sinners in the Church.

"On the ninth, tenth and eleventh articles there is agreement.

"In the twelfth article, Of Sin, we do not deny that Repentance consists of three parts, viz., Contrition, which is alarm, and leads to the confession of sin. Confession. Yet here we should have proper regard to absolution, and should believe that sin is forgiven on account of the merit of Christ. The third part is Satisfaction. Thus we hold alike. Yet we are not agreed as to whether satisfaction is necessary to the remission of punishment.

"On the thirteenth article there is agreement.

"On the fourteenth article there is agreement, so far as pertains to words. But the subject has been referred to the article, *Of Ecclesiastical Power.*

"The fifteenth article has been referred to the article, *Of Episcopal Jurisdiction and Monastic Vows.*

"On the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth articles there is agreement.

"On the twentieth article, so much as pertains to the preachers and the Apology, for these will be considered in the proper

* Chytraeus gives the Latin text thus: Quod *remissio peccatorum fiat per gratiam gratum facientem et per fidem in nobis.* P. 267. Spalatin has written: "In the fifth, sixth and seventh articles we are agreed." Förstemann, II., p. 231, *margin.*

place, since we are not considering such things in this negotiation. But as regards the faith, we abide by the fourth article and the declaration in regard to it. In regard to good works, we are agreed that we must and ought to do good works, and that works that proceed from faith and grace are well-pleasing to God. But whether these works are meritorious, or in what manner they are meritorious, also whether or how we shall trust in them—here there is no agreement. Hence it is deferred.

"On the twenty-first article we are agreed in regard to two points, namely, that the saints and angels with God in heaven pray for us; and the custom of the Church which cherishes the memory of the saints and prays God to assist us by the prayers of the Church, is Christian and is to be held. But as regards the invocation of the saints, we are agreed in this, namely, that there exists no express command of the Scriptures which enjoins upon anyone the invocation of the saints. But as to whether the saints, according to the received custom of the Universal Church, may be invoked with intention—on this there is difference of opinion, since the Elector, the Princes and other allies regard it as doubtful and as dangerous on account of the many abuses, and because there is no express Scripture for it." *

This is the first, and, consequently, the oldest official declaration (*Erklärung* is the title in German) made in regard to the Augsburg Confession, and it was made by no less than seven persons, who had been active in the preparation of the Confession, two of whom had signed it as containing the doctrines taught by their preachers in their dominions. Then, too, it must be borne in mind that this declaration or explanation was such as satisfied the minds of the most pronounced adherents of the Roman Catholic Church, as Duke George, Eck and Wimpina. The question must here be raised, Is such declaration or explanation the true and intended meaning of the Augsburg Confession? Or, in other words, Were such doctrines taught in the dominions of the subscribers of the Augsburg Confession? Or was such a declaration or explanation wrung from the Committee in view of threatened and impending evils? If we affirm in regard to

* Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, II., 230 *et seqq.*, taken from Spalatin's Manuscript found in the Ansbach Archives. There is also a copy in the Weimar Archives. It is probable that J. J. Müller copied this into his *Historie*, pp. 745, *et seqq.* It varies in some places from Förstemann's copy. In Jena edition of Luther's Works, V., 103, 104. St. Louis ed., XVI., 1383-4. Latin in Coelestin, III., 55, 56. Chytraeus, 267, 268. These texts also differ somewhat from each other. But the differences are not material.

the first two questions, then the Augsburg Confession, in its chief articles, *includes,* rather than *excludes,* the characteristic teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. If we deny in regard to the first two, then we are forced to affirm in regard to the third question, and consequently to declare that the Lutheran seven were deficient in those qualities of moral heroism for which some of them have been long and loudly praised. The data given in the Declaration furnish the legitimate premises for one or the other of these conclusions.

But the historian does not have for his chief mission the deduction of conclusions, but the exhibition of the facts. There is the Declaration. It speaks for itself. It shows conclusively that the Protestant seven were willing to make peace on terms that must have proved humiliating to themselves, and disastrous to their cause. Their compromise on Article IV. of the Confession fully justifies Seckendorf's comment that it contains the seeds of disputes.* They had indeed, in great part, at least, if not entirely, surrendered the acropolis of the Lutheran Confession, namely, that men are justified by faith alone for the sake of Christ. Had concord been established on the basis of this *Declaration,* there can be no doubt that the way would have been opened in the dominions of the Princes for the restoration of the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification as the same had been taught in the scholastic theology, and as it was subsequently promulgated officially by the Council of Trent.

And what shall we say in regard to Article X.? Here the agreement is categorical. The German texts are all alike, except in the spelling: Im Neunden, zcehenden und eilfften artickeln ist man gleich, that is, in articles nine, ten and eleven they are agreed. In the Latin, Coelestin has: In 9, 10, 11 articulis consentimus, that is, in articles 9, 10, 11 we agree. In Chytraeus: In 9, 10, 11 consensus est, that is, in 9, 10, 11 there is agreement. Hence, we are bound to conclude either that the Protestant seven had allowed the Catholic seven to understand Article X. in their own way, and to read into it the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrament, or that they held at the time, and had purposely expressed in Article X., a view of the sacrament that could be harmonized with the Roman Catholic teaching. The latter alternative, rather than the former, must be accepted. The explanation given by Pastor, that Eck understood the theological terms

* *Historia Lutheranismi,* II., 179.

in the scholastic sense, and Melanchthon in the new sense given to them by Luther, is totally inadequate.* It only exposes Melanchthon to the charge of deception, since he knew the scholastic meaning of theological terms just as well as Eck did. He could not have failed to understand Eck's meaning. Moreover, his own language shows what he must have meant, unless again we are willing to subject him to the charge of purposeful deception. For already on the fourth he had written to Cardinal Campeggius: "We confess that in the species of the bread the true body of Christ is contained, or by concomitance, the blood, and therefore the whole Christ. In the species of the wine likewise the whole Christ," † and had used the very language of Mediæval Catholicism. In the Apology (*Prima Adumbratio*) offered to the Emperor September 22d, he wrote: "Of the tenth. Neither do we imagine that the dead body of Christ is taken in the sacrament, or the body without the blood, nor the blood without the body. But we believe that the whole living Christ is present in either part of the sacrament." ‡

And that they did not mean to exclude the doctrine of transubstantiation, we can readily conclude from the defense of Article X. in the first edition of the Apology, published with the *editio princeps* of the Confession in 1531. Here, on the one hand, Melanchthon writes not one word against the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Lord's Supper; but on the other hand, he introduces the word *essentialiter,* which had been disiderated in the Catholic Confutation and also in the first session of the Committee of Fourteen, and quotes with approbation from the Greek Canon of the Mass as follows: "We have learned that not only the Roman Church affirms the bodily presence of Christ, but the Greek Church both now holds and formerly did hold the same view. For that is proved by their Canon of the Mass, in which the Priest publicly prays that when the bread is changed it may become the body of Christ. And the Bulgarian (Theophilact of Bulgaria), a writer, as it seems to us, not foolish, says that the bread is not only a figure, but is truly changed into the flesh of Christ." § And that this article was interpreted in favor

* *Reunionsbestrebungen,* p. 48.

† C. R. II., 246.

‡ C. R. XXVII., 285, 333. In the chief parts Melanchthon employs the very language of the Papal Confutation. C. R. XXVII., 106. See Cochlaeus, I. II., *Artickeln:* "Under the species of bread and wine and under each of the same, the true body and the true blood of Christ our Saviour, are essentially and truly present." A. IV., 4.

§ In Jonas' German translation of the Apology and in the edition that

of transubstantiation by the Catholic writers is known to all who have read the lucubrations of Andrew Fabricius in his *Harmonia Confessionis Augustanae.*

It is also surprising that there should have been agreement in regard to the eleventh article. Spalatin has recorded exactly the following: "Of Article XI., *Of Confession,* Dr. Eck says: 'In the chief thing (*Haubtsach*) it agrees with the Church. The sin which one does not know, one need not confess.' "*

When we recall that the canons of the Roman Catholic Church require every member of that Church to confess at least once a year, and that, too, to his or her own priest, we cannot but conclude that there was either a great lack of candor, or an enormous self-deception on the part of the evangelical members of the Committee of Fourteen. They knew, every one of them, what was meant in the Roman Catholic Church by *Confessio* (Beicht), and *absolutio privata.* Every one of them had gone to Confession and had received private absolution many a time before he had allied himself with Luther; and they all must have known what Eck meant by "the chief thing."

Hence, the Protestant seven were by no means justified in allowing Eck, and his part of the Committee, to rest unchallenged in the canonic and traditional sense of those words, unless they themselves meant that they should be so understood by themselves and by their party. Eck may have been cunning, but, undoubtedly, the Evangelicals were either weak or obtuse. Hence, the Nürnberg Senate was fully justified in its sharp censure of the concession made in this article, since such concession involved the return essentially to the Roman Catholic auricular confession and the enumeration of sins, and connected the Eucharist inseparably with Confession.†

Something also might be said about the agreement on Article XIII. But we must remember that this article, as it was read and presented to the Emperor, did not have the damnatory paragraph about the *opus operatum.* Neither did Article XVIII. have, at that time, the damnatory paragraph. Even the partial agreement on Article XX. gives occasion for surprise, since in this article the Confession had borne explicit testimony against

accompanied the octavo edition of the Confession (autumn of 1531) the quotation from the Bulgarian is omitted. Already it had given offence. See *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1900, p. 387, *note.*

* *Annales,* p. 167.

† Coelestin, III., 81; Chytraeus, p. 299.

the Roman Catholic teaching, that men are justified by faith and works.

But the minds and hearts of the Protestant seven were so intently centered on the work of reconciliation, that they seem not to have comprehended the significance and the bearing of the Catholic demands, and of their own concessions. They had clasped hands with the Catholic seven on fifteen articles of the Augsburg.

And that the extent of the Protestant concessions may become still clearer to us, we present the following from the Catholic side.* "The first part of the Confession contains twenty-one articles, in which they agree with us entirely in fifteen, but in the others partly: For three are deferred to the Abuses, namely, the eleventh, the fourteenth, and the fifteenth. Three differ in part, namely, the twelfth, the twentieth and the twenty-first.

Agree	I.	To be treated later	XI.	Differ in part	XII.
	II.		XIV.		XX.
	III.		XV.		XXI."
	IV.				
	V.				
	VI.				
	VII.				
	VIII.				
	IX.				
	X.				
	XIII.				
	XVI.				
	XVII.				
	XVIII.				
	XIX.				

"In discussing justifying faith," says this report, "we were unwilling to admit that we are justified by faith alone, because the Apostle James does not admit that. Then it was agreed to say that we are justified by faith, but not by faith alone, because no Scripture has that, but rather the contrary. Therefore, when the word *Sola* was omitted, it was agreed that justification or remission of sins takes place per gratiam gratum

* Given by J. J. Müller, p. 775 *et seqq.* The tabulated exhibit is found in Coelestin, III., 44; Chytraeus, *Historia* (German), p. 150; in Chytraeus (Latin), p. 243; in Müller, p. 781.

facientem et fidem formaliter per verbum et sacramentum instrumentaliter, that is, by grace that makes acceptable, and by faith formally, and through the Word and the sacrament instrumentally.'' Of the tenth article this report says: ''They agree that the body and blood of the Lord are truly present, and for better explanation vere et realiter, German, wesentlich was added.'' Of the thirteenth article it is said: ''They agree that the sacraments were instituted, not only that they might be marks of profession among men, but rather that they might be signs and testimonies of the will of God toward us.'' Of article eighteen it is said: ''They agree that man has free-will, but without grace it cannot work grace.''

It will thus be seen that the Committee had agreed on fifteen out of the twenty-one Articles of Faith; that they had partly agreed in regard to three others, and that three were to be discussed in connection with the Articles on Abuses. The concessions were almost entirely from the Protestant side. Hence, the Catholics, in their report, could represent the Lutherans as agreeing with them. It is certain that the Lutheran seven virtually surrendered the article that, more than any other, is distinctive of Lutheranism, ''the article of the standing and falling Church.'' Indeed had reunion been effected on the basis of the report of either half of the Committee (and the two reports are essentially identical), Protestantism would have been strangled in the hour of its birth, and Rome would have regained her sway over the entire German Church. The fact is, the Protestants, as we shall hereafter learn, had almost completely lost their courage, and seemed willing—that is, the Saxons and Margravians—to purchase peace at almost any price. Happily, there was an influence, partly from without and partly from within—the Nürnbergers, the Lüneburgers, the Hessians and *Luther*—which saved the day.

CHAPTER XI.

EFFORTS AT RECONCILIATION.—CONTINUED.

In the afternoon of August 18th, the joint Committee met at the *Rathaus* and took up the Second Part of the Confession.* The Catholics preferred to begin with the last article, fearing that a report should reach the people about the action on both species in the Eucharist. But when the Lutherans objected, the Catholics prepared terms in writing, protesting, however, that "they would not decide nor conclude anything, but would refer everything to the Estates and to the Emperor." † The proposition of the Catholics was laid before the Lutherans the next day, and is as follows:

"By permission of the Apostolic See or of its Legate, and with the consent of the Emperor, the supreme advocate of the Church, both species of the sacrament be allowed the Lutherans on about the following terms:

"I. That their pastors administer both species to their own parishioners only, and only in those places where such custom has prevailed for some years already.

"II. That it be preceded by private confession, according to ancient custom.

"III. That at Easter, and whenever this sacrament be administered, they teach the people that God has not commanded to receive both species.

"IV. That they teach that the entire Christ is present, and is received under one species not less than under both.

"V. That they teach that those do not sin who commune under only one species.

"VI. That when their subjects desire only one species, they shall give, or cause it to be given to them.

"VII. That they shall not reserve the species of wine, nor carry it through the streets to the sick, but in the Church or at home during the celebration of the Masses, administer both species to those who desire them." ‡

* Spalatin, *Annales*, p. 169; J. J. Müller, p. 781.
† Schirrmacher, pp. 222, 223.
‡ Schirrmacher, pp. 229, 230; Coelestin, III., 44*b*; Chytraeus, pp. 244, 245.

The next day, August 20th, the Lutherans reply:

"They are willing that the sacrament be preceded by confession. They are willing that their pastors and preachers speak pacifically on these subjects until there is a future decision in a council. They confess likewise that the entire body of Christ is under the species of bread. They deny that hitherto they had forbidden the sacrament under one kind to anyone, where it could be had. They deny that among them the species of wine had been reserved in vessels or carried to the sick. Finally they wish that the venerable sacrament be held in honor among them as hitherto."

Such is the Lutheran Reply as reported in Schirrmacher, and by Coelestin and Chytraeus, who proceed to say: "When the Catholics sought to have certain ambiguous words explained, the Lutherans, after considering the matter for some time, replied, August 21st, that every person intending to commune should previously make confession on the more important points by which his conscience was burdened, in order to seek counsel and consolation on these things.

"Secondly, they declare that they believe that the entire Christ, his body and blood, true God and man, is truly under either species, or under the alternate species: Sub utraque specie aut etiam sub utralibet, aut altera vere esse.

"Thirdly, they declare, during the discussion, that they do not condemn those who formerly took, or now take, only one species. Neither do they believe that they do wrong who receive one species. Nevertheless, they are not willing to have this preached to theirs. Also the deliberation between the seven and the seven was only in regard to both species. Hence, it is evident that there was not much difference between the parties on this subject. For in these things they differ from us only in that, while they and we believe that those do not sin who receive one species, they (the Lutherans) do not want this preached to theirs, though they confess that the entire Christ is truly under one species. Nevertheless, they contend that the command of Christ, given alike to ministers and to laymen, is to take both, because he said: 'Drink ye all of it.' But ours respond from Mark: 'And they all drank of it,' so that it is understood that it was said to the twelve disciples who supped with him. Hence, but for obstinacy, there would easily have been an agreement on this subject."*

* Coelestin, III., 44*b*.

The demands of the Catholics, as noted above, are distinct and unequivocal. The concessions made are very small, and of very limited application. They make no surrender or modification of the *principle* of communion under one species. The Protestants may administer the communion under both species to their own parishioners, and *only* in those places where the custom has long been in use.

The reply of the Lutherans must be regarded as ambiguous and evasive. It does not categorically reject the communion under one species, as the Confessors had done on the basis of the Scriptures and of history in Article XXII. of the Confession. It virtually denies what had been there affirmed. Moreover, concomitance is admitted in amplest terms, and the private confession of the more important sins is approved, and is conceded as a prerequisite to communion. Hence, as a consequence of the *slight* concessions made by the Catholic seven and of the *large* concessions made by the Lutheran seven, the *report* is justified in saying that "there was not much difference between the parties on this subject," that is, on the Article *De Utraque Specie Sacramenti* (Art. XXII.).

2. *The Propositions of the Catholics.*

Having failed to agree on Article XXII. the joint Committee took the remaining articles of the Confession in order. The propositions of the Catholic seven and the responses of the Lutheran seven are reported by Spalatin, and are given with great fulness in Latin by Schirrmacher, Coelestin and Chytraeus, and in German by J. J. Müller. But as they are too long to be transferred in full to these pages, we content ourselves here with a synopsis.

1. In regard to the marriage of priests, the Catholics demanded that it should be tolerated only where the custom had existed for some time already; that there be no new marriages; that priests should be allowed to return to celibacy; that, so soon as it could be done, celibate priests be put into the places of married ones; that married priests be ejected from office, unless a dispensation could be obtained from the Pope or his legate.

The Lutherans reply by making reference to their Confession, where they give reasons for the marriage of the clergy. "On this subject there was no further discussion between the

seven and the seven, because there was greater difference here than in regard to both species,'' says the report.

2. In regard to the Mass, the Catholics demand that both public and private Masses shall be celebrated on the altar at the usual festivals, and that both canons of the Mass be used, adding that in the Mass Christ is offered mystically and figuratively in memory of his passion on the Cross.

The Lutherans reply that the Masses are celebrated in the usual ecclesiastical attire, and with the usual ceremonies. When they are interrogated about the Canon and about Private Masses, they make no written reply, but persist in rejecting the Canon and Private Masses.

3. In regard to Confession, Article XXV., the Catholics propose nothing in writing, because the matter had been already treated in Article XI. when discussing the parts of penitence. The Lutherans refer to that in their written reply, and add these three things: First, that confession ought not to be omitted, on account of the great consolation in the absolution. Secondly, that it may be known how grand and salutary is the power of the Keys. Thirdly, that the people may be accustomed to confess their sins; also that those sins are remitted which are not enumerated. On these subjects there was no need of further discussion between the parties.

4. Under Article XXVI., *Of the Difference of Meats,* the Catholics proposed the restoration of fasts, festivals, confessions, prayers, processions, ceremonies and the distinctions of foods and times, as they had been observed by the Catholic Church from of old. The Lutherans respond that for the sake of charity, and for the peace and unity of the Church, general ceremonies may be observed, but that they are not to be regarded as necessary to the worship of God. They consent that for the hearing of the Word of God, and for the administration of the sacraments, the following days are to be observed: All Sundays, Christmas, St. Stephen's, St John the Evangelist's, the Lord's Circumcision, Epiphany, Holy Week for celebrating the Passion of Christ, Easter with two or three holidays, Ascension Day, Pentecost with two or three holidays, the Principal Festivals of the Virgin, the Feasts of all the Apostles.

5. Coming to Article XXVII., *Of Monastic Vows,* the Catholics demand the complete restoration of the monastic institution, in all its privileges and exemptions. The Lutherans refer to what they had said on these matters in their Confession, ex-

press their willingness to leave it to the consciences of monks and nuns to remain in the cloisters or to leave them until a decision could be obtained from a council, are willing to allow the monks and nuns their accustomed manner of life, dress and ceremonies, are willing to defend them from violence and wish to leave the income of the dismantled monasteries with the secular power for the purpose of supporting those who have gone out, and also for supporting preachers, parishes and schools, until a council could be held.

6. As touching Article XXVIII., *Of Ecclesiastical Power,* the Catholics demand that the power and jurisdiction of the Bishops remain intact. As regards abuses, they order that the Lutheran Princes shall consult with the other Princes of the Empire, and shall obey the common conclusion; though should trouble arise with the Bishops as regards jurisdiction, or in any other matter, the Lutheran Princes shall suffer no prejudice on account of such an arrangement. The Lutherans agree that the jurisdiction and power of the Bishops shall remain, yet they refuse to justify their neglect of preaching, of the administration of the sacraments, of ordination and other abuses; that the pastors and preachers should be subject to the Bishops, that ecclesiastical jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical should not be impeded, and that episcopal excommunication, in cases appertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, shall not be impeded, provided it be done in accordance with the teaching of the Scriptures.

"All these things as they had been transacted, were laid before the Electors and other Princes and Estates of the Holy Roman Empire by the Catholic deputies, August 22d, and publicly read,"* that is, the Report, of which we have given a synopsis above, was read by the Catholic members of the Committee as their Report of the transactions of the Committee of Fourteen.

3. *The Lutheran Corrections.*

Both Coelestin and Chytraeus say that the Report of the Catholics is not accurate, and that it was therefore found necessary to have corrections made.* This, of course, was done by Melanchthon, and it cannot be denied that his corrections do change the purview, though they still leave much to be desired. We cannot here quote all that he wrote in correction of the

* Coelestin, III., 47; Chytraeus, p. 253.

Catholic Report, but it is important and just that we recite in full the most essential point: "In regard to Article IV., of Justifying Faith, they report that there was agreement, so as to say: That we are justified by faith, but not by faith alone, because that is not contained in the Scripture, but rather the contrary. But we do not concede that it is not contained in the Scripture that we are justified by faith alone, but that the contrary is contained. Therefore, we openly contradicted it by quoting Paul, Rom. 3: 'Without works,' and Ephesians 2: 'It is the gift of God,' and, 'Without works.'

"Then, after a long discussion, our opponents conceded that remission of sins occurs neither on account of preceding nor of subsequent works or merits.

"Likewise they said that it occurs through faith: And they added, per gratiam gratum facientem: They added also sacramenta.

"When this was conceded, we said that we did not exclude gratiam and sacramenta by the word Sola, but that we exclude works. That if they would confess that remission of sins occurs through faith, not on account of merits preceding or following, we would not quarrel about the word SOLA. And the addition was made to our Article that we confess that remission of sins occurs per gratiam gratum facientem et fidem formaliter, per Verbum et Sacramenta instrumentaliter. The Princes of both sides remember that this was the order of the transaction." *

In regard to the other points this is the substance:

1. Of the invocation of the saints, both sides agree that it is not expressly commanded in the Scriptures.

2. That in confession only the chief sins should be enumerated.

3. That they do not wish to teach that those who receive the sacrament under one form do not sin. They excuse those who take the sacrament under one form from necessity and compulsion.

4. In regard to celibacy they say that all do not possess the gift from God. Hence, it is to tempt God, to refuse the use of God's order without the gift.

5. Against the allegation of the Catholics that they have rejected Private Masses and the Canon without just reason, they reply that they gave ample reasons why they could not approve either. The common Mass is observed by them with great

* Coelestin, III., folio 47.

reverence and with the usual ceremonies. Masses for the dead have no value. Very many come to the sacrament *causa ventris*, and hence receive no benefit.

These corrections do change the purview, though they are by no means satisfactory, and, as we shall learn hereafter, they gave grave offence to many in the Lutheran party. But as Melanchthon's corrections were too long to be read before the Emperor, they were reduced to two articles: *Of Both Species of the Sacrament* and *Of the Marriage of Priests.*

As these two articles were presented as a kind of ultimatum on the part of the Lutherans, they should appear here in full.

Of Both Species of the Sacrament.

"1. The institution of Christ and the distinct word of the Evangelists is: Drink ye all of it.

"2. That it was so observed formerly in the entire Church by the Holy Fathers and Bishops, for more than a thousand years.

"3. It is not known when, nor by whom, the species of the wine was abolished—not indeed in the Canons.

"4. The Emperor should consider that a divine command is not abrogated by the reasons adduced and by the writings inappropriately cited by the opponents.

"5. We cannot consent that the species of the wine should be prohibited.

"6. Nothing in the divine appointments is to be rashly changed, nor are we to consent to changes.

"7. Much less can we approve and praise it when the opponents say that it is an abuse for the laity to receive both species. For an institution of Christ cannot be called an abuse.

"8. In regard to these things Christ has threatened, Matt. 5, that whosoever shall break one of the least of the commandments shall be least."

Of the Marriage of the Priests.

"1. This subject does not call for a long discussion, for it is clear.

"2. The contrary is an impious opinion, because it is a doctrine of devils.

"3. It is contrary to the command of God.

"4. It is contrary to the creation of God.

"5. It is contrary to the order of God.

"6. It is an impossible vow.

"7. But a vow cannot take away the command, creation and order of God.

"8. Only let the Emperor consider how great is the scandal everywhere.

"9. The opponents do well to laud chastity, but why do they not practice that which they praise? Also there is chastity in Marriage, as Paphnutius says.

"10. Inasmuch as they declare that chastity is possible, why do they not also exhibit it? The lives of the celibate priests are known.

"11. Even though chastity were possible, nevertheless marriage is not to be prohibited by law. For it lays a snare for consciences, and is a doctrine of demons, and has given power to the Pope to load the priests with this burden.

"12. Ambrose has said: Chastity can be only recommended; it cannot be enjoined. It is a matter of wish rather than of command.

"13. Moreover, it is a divine command: Let each one have his own wife. Let a Bishop be the husband of one wife. Not all can receive this word: It is not good for a man to be alone. But a divine command cannot be removed by a human prohibition, for the obligation of the contracting parties is a matter of the divine law.

"14. They that prohibit marriage become guilty, and are partakers of all the scandals and fornications.

"15. They also become participants and guilty of the shedding of all the blood of all who are killed on this account.

"16. It would also be a great cruelty to deprive the Church of its priests by prohibiting or separating them from pious wives. For where could we get suitable celibates for all the parishes?

"17. For many centuries in the primitive Church, even upon the confession of the opponents, the marriage of priests and Bishops was practiced.

"18. Even to-day in the Eastern Church there are married priests." *

The Joint Committee of Fourteen finished its work August 22d.† The same day the Lutheran part of the Committee made a verbal report at the lodging of the Elector of Saxony.‡ The

* Coelestin, III., 48, 49. † Coelestin, III., 49*b*. ‡ C. R. II., 300, 301.

Catholic part of the Committee reported to the Catholic Estates at the *Rathaus*.* Seckendorf says, justly, that neither party expressed itself with sufficient accuracy and perspicuity. Each party concealed rather than revealed its true sentiment, and each party accused the other of the lack of candor. Yet there were still unreduced differences, but the concessions made by the Lutherans were far-reaching,—"concessions, which, in fact, involved the restoration of the externals of the Church to an extent such as was no longer to be expected."† Consequently the propositions and concessions made by the Lutherans awoke strong opposition from within their own ranks.‡

But with these reports and statements the negotiations of the Committee terminated. "Doctrine," as Plitt says, "had been wholly cast aside," and the discussions had been narrowed to two or three articles, about which there was the chief contention, namely, the sacrament and the marriage of the priests. But on these points neither party would yield to the other. With the Catholics it was a matter of tradition and of the Church's teaching. With the Lutherans it was a matter of conscience and of the teaching of the Scriptures. Thus the Committee of Fourteen failed to agree on a basis of reconciliation.

The learned and judicious Rotermund has closed his account of the transactions of the Committee of Fourteen with the following observations: "Both formerly and in recent times the two parties engaged in efforts to restore harmony have been bitterly reproached. The Roman Catholics have been accused of cunningly and deceitfully circumventing the Evangelicals by trying to make the impression of a reformation in doctrine, in order to lead them again under the domination of the Church. It must indeed be conceded that they used cunning artifices for the purpose of recovering their opponents from so wide an estrangement. But it certainly could not have been their purpose to deceive them. Melanchthon and the two others of his party must have been extraordinarily short-sighted, not to have observed in the beginning of the colloquy, that the Roman Catholics were not willing to change anything in the essentials of their faith and church polity. Never did the hope of peace between the Protestants and the Roman Catholic Church seem so near its realization as in the negotiations of the two com-

* Schirrmacher, p. 524; Cochlaeus, *Historia*, p. 406.
† Von Ranke, *Geschichte*, III., 197.
‡ See Möller-Kawerau *Kirchengeschichte*, dritte Aufl., III., p. 113.

mittees from the 16th to the 20th of August, and never would a peace have brought with it such pernicious consequences for the Protestants, as this one, had it been effected. If the ruling of a higher power be not recognized here, then it remains inexplicable, that a better use was not made of the yielding temper of the Protestants. Both parties were agreed on the first ten, the thirteenth, the sixteenth to the nineteenth articles of the Confession. Fortunately, the negotiations with reference to the Lord's Supper came to naught." *

But in justice to Melanchthon, and also as an important sidelight on this entire section of Lutheran confessional history, we add here a report written by Melanchthon, August 21st, on the articles which had not been settled by the Committee:

"1. That faith makes righteous before God, not our work or service which goes before or follows; but for the sake of Christ, if we believe that God for the sake of Christ is gracious to us.

"2. That we ought to do good works, though we do not thereby merit grace and righteousness before God; but faith acquires grace not on account of our work.

"3. That in Confession it is not necessary to enumerate sins.

"4. That though sorrow and repentance must and ought to exist, yet sins are not forgiven on account of sorrow, but through faith, if we trust the absolution, or the Gospel, that for Christ's sake our sins are forgiven. Therefore, repentance must be followed by faith, which comforts the conscience, and believes that sins are forgiven for the sake of Christ.

"5. That it is not necessary for the remission of penalty to add satisfaction in repentance.

"6. That the sacraments do not justify without faith, *ex opere operato.*

"7. That for the true unity of the Church and of the faith uniformity of human institutions is not necessary, but agreement in Articles of Faith and in the use of the sacraments.

"8. That worship instituted by men, without the command and Word of God, for the purpose of meriting grace, are contrary to the Gospel, and obscure the merit of Christ.

"9. That cloister-vows and the monastic life, instituted as the worship of God for the purpose of meriting grace, are contrary to the Gospel.

"10. That human ordinances, which can be held without sin,

* *Geschichte,* p. 131.

and promote good order in the Church, should be observed out of love to avoid offence. That we should understand that such works are not a necessary worship of God. Also that the Bishops have no right to oppress consciences with such traditions. Therefore it is not a sin if such traditions be dropped without giving offence.

"11. The invocation of the saints is an uncertain and dangerous thing. It obscures the office of Christ whom the Scriptures hold up to us as Mediator and Redeemer.

"12. That those who forbid both forms act contrary to the institution of Christ and the Scriptures.

"13. That those who forbid marriage act contrary to the command of God, which commands to flee unchastity, and that each should have his own wife.

"14. That the Mass is not a work which merits grace *ex opere operato,* or even merits the application of grace to others. But the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ in order that grace may be offered to us who receive it by faith, not *ex opere operato.*" *

He then tells us that these doctrines are held by the Elector of Saxony and his allies as right and Christian, and that if there be other controverted doctrines, these should be referred to a council, but meanwhile one party should not be assaulted by the other.

There can be scarcely a doubt that this *Opinion* was written by command of the Elector. One cannot but wish that some of the steadfastness which it exhibits had been injected into the Confession as the same was delivered to the Emperor.

Another side-light on these peace negotiations is furnished by Melanchthon's letter to Luther, written August 22d:

"Yesterday we ended the Conference, or rather the Strife, which was conducted in the presence of Judges. At the beginning the Judges were *Henry of Brunswick, the Bishop of Augsburg, Eck, Cochlaeus.* Later Duke George took the place of Henry of Brunswick. For *Brunswick* was required to follow the Macedonian (Philip of Hesse), who, they fear, is mustering an army. In regard to the doctrines, things are about as follows: Eck found fault about the word *Sola,* when we say *that men are justified by faith.* Yet he did not condemn it, but said that the unsophisticated are offended. I forced him to confess that the righteousness of faith is correctly taught by us. Nevertheless,

* C. R. II., 297-9.

he wanted us to write *that we are justified by grace and faith.* I did not object, but that fool does not know the meaning of the word grace. There was another dispute about the remission of penalty and about satisfactions. There was a third about merits. On these two subjects there was no agreement. Though he did not assign much to merit, we did not accept that even. Then we took up the subject of both species. Here he tried hard to show that it is not commanded to take both species. We regarded it as absolutely indifferent whether we take one or both. And if we should teach this, he would cheerfully allow us both species. I could not accept this, and yet I excused those who hitherto by mistake have taken one, for they clamored that we are condemning the entire Church. What think you? The appointment of Christ refers to the laity and to the clergy. Hence, when we are forced to use the sacrament, minds ought to retain the form of the entire sacrament. If you think thus, write it unequivocally. In regard to the Mass, Vows, Marriage, there was no dispute. Only some propositions were made. These we did not accept. I cannot divine what the end will be. For although our opponents also need peace, yet some seem not to consider how great will be the danger if the matter should result in war. We propose very moderate conditions. We render obedience and jurisdiction to the Bishops, and we promise to restore the common ceremonies. What weight this will have I do not know. You will pray Christ to preserve us." *

This letter confirms rather than contradicts the report rendered by the Catholic Committee. It shows that large concessions had been made by the Lutherans, and that the distance between the two halves of the Committee is not very great. But the letter also helps to confirm the impression, made at every step of the negotiations, that the Catholic party regarded no reconciliation possible that stopped short of a complete submission on the part of their opponents.

3. *The Emperor's Diplomacy.*

But while the Joint Committee was disputing over the Articles of Faith, the Emperor Charles was plying the arts of diplomacy. Through the Bishop of Mayence and through Frederick of the Palatinate and others, he tried to get George of Brandenburg and the Elector of Saxony to abandon the cause of the Reformation on which they had embarked. To the Elector he

* C. R. II., 299.

refused formal installation over his own dominions, except upon condition that he would first return to favor with the Roman Church. He declared to George that, unless he obeyed, the title of his nephew, son of his brother Casimir, should be taken from him.

And the Landgrave of Hesse was approached with the promise that if he would make his peace with the Emperor, Ulrich, Duke of Würtemberg, should be reinstated, and that the controversy which he had with the Count of Nassau should be settled by the intervention of the Emperor. But nothing was effected by these diplomatic efforts.*

* Schirrmacher, p. 241.

CHAPTER XII.

THE EFFORTS AT RECONCILIATION.—CONCLUDED.

THE failure of the Committee of Fourteen to agree upon a basis of reconciliation did not deter either party from further efforts. The fact that only two or three matters, and those appertaining to ceremonies, and not really to doctrines, remained unsettled, encouraged the so-called Catholic middle party to try again. They thought that the difficulty was connected with persons rather than with the subjects at issue. Duke George especially was regarded as the stumbling-block. Hence it was resolved by the Catholics to eliminate him from the negotiations. But in order to do this diplomatically, some of the Catholic Princes importuned the Elector of Saxony to agree to the appointment of a committee of three on each side further to consider the points at issue. But such a proposition did not commend itself to some of the Lutherans. Some looked upon it as "vexatious and knavish," and they discussed the matter in three separate meetings. Finally they agreed to it, but with the distinct understanding that nothing more was to be conceded to the Catholics.*

1. *The Committee of Six.*

On the side of the Catholics, Bernhard Hagen, Chancellor of the Elector of Cologne; Hieronymus Vehus, Chancellor of Baden, and Dr. John Eck; on the side of the Lutherans, Dr. Gregory Brück, Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony; Dr. Sebastian Heller, Chancellor of Margrave George of Brandenburg, and Philip Melanchthon; were chosen to constitute a Committee of Six.† The Lutheran three were instructed to confine themselves to five points: The Mass, Communion under both kinds, the Marriage of Priests, Monastic Vows, Episcopal Power, and to make no additional concessions, and to ascertain whether the opposite party would make additional concessions.‡

August 24th the Joint Committee of Six met at the *Rathaus*.

* C. R. II., 312; Schirrmacher, p. 242; Spalatin, p. 189; Sleidan (English Translation), p. 132.

† Cochlaeus, *Commentaria*, p. 212; C. R. II., 312; Förstemann, II., 291; Coelestin, III., 60; Gieseler, IV., 142, 143.

‡ *Strassburg Politis. Corresp.*, p. 487.

Immediately the Catholics insisted on communion in one kind, on the Mass with the traditional ceremonies, and with both canons, on priestly celibacy, on the support of the cloisters with the wonted service and dress, and on the episcopal government of the churches; in a few words, they insisted on almost everything that was distinctive of the Roman Catholic system of doctrine and practice. But the Lutheran Three are now clearly on the alert, and place themselves much more in an attitude of defense than they had done when acting on the Committee of Fourteen. The severe but just condemnation of their former course, and the conditions that had attended their appointment on this Committee, had not only tied their hands, but had evidently quickened their Protestant consciences and strengthened their nerves. They do not now seem like the same men. Hence, they reply to the proposals of the Catholics in a more positive tone: They cannot permit the communion under one kind, except in cases of necessity. They cannot tolerate Private Masses, since such Masses are regarded as an *opus operatum*, and as sacrifices for the living and the dead. They reject the celibacy of the clergy, because it is a human invention, and marriage is an order of God. They will abide by what was agreed to in the Committee of Fourteen. They wish to refer the matter of episcopal government and of church ceremonies to a free general council.* But during this, as at other meetings, the Catholics indulged in "the most atrocious threats," and Melanchthon complains of the utter lack of courage in the Lutheran Princes.† And in this criticism of the Lutheran Princes Melanchthon is abundantly sustained by the recorded observations of other Lutherans who were at Augsburg in an official capacity. Hence, others rather than Melanchthon are to blame for the concessions that were made.

Two days later, Friday, August 26th, in the afternoon, the Committee of Six met again at the *Rathaus*. But the Catholics proposed nothing essentially new as a means of reconciliation. The Catholics refused to remove any of the abuses, since they held that "their usages were right and must abide, and that in some things they would only have patience with the Lutherans." The Lutherans again refuse to concur in the proposals which had been made, "but declare that should other Christian proposals

* Coelestin, III., 60 *et seqq.;* Förstemann, II., 290 *et seqq.;* C. R. II., 312-314. The Proposals of the Catholics and the Reply of the Lutherans are given by Müller, *Historie*, pp. 801 *et seqq.*, taken from Brück's *Geschichte*.

† C. R. II., 314.

be made, such as would bring no burden upon their consciences, another interview would not be declined." In subsequent negotiations the Catholics reported that since agreement could not be effected the Emperor was disposed to order a council, but under the condition that all innovations, both in doctrine and in church usages, should be discontinued among the Protestants, "and thus the common Church should be restored." *

To these later proposals which, we repeat, really contain nothing new, the Lutherans reply that, inasmuch as through the carelessness and neglect of the Bishops, false and seductive doctrines and usages have been introduced into the churches, as was shown in the Articles of the Confession, the Princes felt bound before God and their own consciences to make a Christian reformation, as justified by the Scriptures and by the laws of the Pope himself. It was in accordance with precedent that in matters of faith a reformation should be introduced. They promise that they will lay the latest proposals of the Catholics before their Principals. This they did, and on Sunday, August 28th, an answer, both verbal and in writing, was rendered. The answer is a state-paper, rather than a theological argument. It reviews the circumstances that attended the appointment and negotiations of the Committee of Fourteen. It then states that the Lutherans had done all that they could do to make peace, and had conceded everything that could be conceded with a good conscience and with a proper regard for the honor of God; they had steadily appealed to a general council, that the Elector and other Orders, notwithstanding the opposition of some of their allies, have consented to the appointment of the Smaller Committee; that the Elector and Princes are not willing to proceed further, nor will they accede to the terms proposed by the Smaller Catholic Committee, since this is not more favorably inclined to peace than was the Larger Committee. But, should more suitable terms be proposed for composing the difficulties, and for establishing peace, the Lutherans are ready to respond. The Catholics know the causes of the Abuses, and the sources of the doctrines contained in the Confession; the only cure for the Abuses in the Church is a free general council; the Catholic Orders should insist on the calling of such a council; that meanwhile the Protestant Orders will do all in their power, by the

* For all the facts contained in this paragraph, see Schirrmacher, pp. 243, 528; Förstemann, II., 301; C. R. II., 313; J. J. Müller, *Historie*, pp. 817-820.

help of God, to promote peace, and will so administer their affairs as to give account to God and to the Emperor.*

This paper, which in all probability was written by Chancellor Brück, is firmer and more decided in tone than any Lutheran paper that had preceded it during the negotiations for peace. There can be no doubt that the Lutheran Three had been strengthened and stimulated by the opposition shown to the concessions made by the Seven. They had remembered their instructions. They probably saw the danger of schism in their own ranks. The Saxons and the Margravians, who had taken the lead in these peace negotiations, almost to the exclusion of their allies in religion, could not afford further to risk the alienation of the Lüneburgers, the Hessians and the Evangelical cities. By some means, perhaps through the clear-sighted criticisms of their allies, the Committee of Three had come to see that the Catholics were ruled by the principle of ecclesiastical authority, by tradition, and by the theology of the Middle Ages.† They had also learned finally that the Catholics would not concede their appeal to a general council, except upon the condition that the Protestants, both in doctrine and in practice, should return to harmonious action with the Catholic Church, that is, would themselves again become Roman Catholics.

These discoveries, which become increasingly manifest in the later negotiations, would naturally lead the Protestants to place more emphasis on the fundamental principle that the Word of God must determine and shape all articles of faith and all usages of the Church. Thus the antitheses of the two systems, of Catholicism on the one hand, and of Lutheranism on the other, rose into greater prominence. At any rate, the Lutherans begin now to act more like Lutherans. A reaction has manifestly set in, and the Answer of August 28th marks the beginning of the end of the peace negotiations.‡ Henceforth the Saxons and the

* Brück's *Geschichte,* pp. 120 *et seqq.;* Müller, *Historie,* pp. 820 *et seqq.;* Chytraeus, pp. 273 *et seqq.;* Förstemann, II., 306 *et seqq.* Latin in Coelestin, III., 59 *et seqq.*

† See Eck's letter to Melanchthon, August 27th (C. R. II., 316, 317), in which he says of the *opus operatum:* "I am so certain of this thing that I would not hesitate to witness to it by my death."

‡ The Margrave of Brandenburg is still greatly frightened, as we learn from his conversation with the Elector of Brandenburg, reported by the Nürnberg legates, August 29th. He believes that war is imminent, and that it would furnish a good opportunity for the Turks to carry out their plans, according to the old proverb: *Duobus litigantibus tertius ridebit.* C. R. II., 319. The Nürnberg commissioners report: "They, the Lutherans, did not think that it was obligatory upon them to betake themselves to methods and proposals beyond what had been already made." C. R. II., p. 321.

Margravians take a firmer stand. Of this we have official evidence: On the morning of August 29th, the Nürnberg legates are assured by Chancellor Brück that "in his opinion nothing additional would be conceded," and when, on the morning of the same day, they lay the Remonstrance of the Nürnberg Senate before the Elector of Saxony, they receive an apologetic answer about the concessions that had been made in the Committee of Fourteen, and are informed that additional concessions will not be made, at least not until others shall have been consulted.

The same morning, Melanchthon and others were commissioned to write a reply to the Catholic Confutation of August 3d.* Three days later, September 1st, Melanchthon wrote to Luther: "Day before yesterday (August 30th), our conference was closed. We refused to accept the conditions in regard to one part of the Sacrament, the Canon, Private Masses, and Celibacy."†

3. *The Remonstrances.*

We have already referred to the dissatisfaction of some of the Lutherans with the concessions made by the Lutheran Seven in the Committee of Fourteen. This had reference particularly to the Hessians, the Lüneburgers and the Nürnbergers.‡ August 23d, the Nürnberg commissioners, Kress and Baumgartner, sent a copy of the Articles of Agreement to their Senate.§ Immediately after its arrival, it was laid before the city council and the theologians of Nürnberg, and on the 26th, a *"Judicium et Censura"* was dispatched to Augsburg, with instructions that it be laid before the Elector of Saxony and the Margrave of Brandenburg.|| In the letter of instructions the Nürnbergers express their displeasure that so much had been done behind their backs, and behind the backs of other allies of the Lutheran cause. They dread the displeasure of the Princes, but they must be true to God, to their own consciences and to their own souls. They say that they can by no means approve the concessions that have been made. The *"Judicium et Censura"* is as follows:

"The Senate of Nürnberg has, so far as the shortness of the time would permit, carefully read and considered the document

* C. R. II., 351; Schirrmacher, p. 530; Plitt, *Apologie der Augustana*, p. 87.

† C. R. II., 336.

‡ Schirrmacher, p. 243.

§ C. R. II., 301.

|| *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg.* Viertes Heft, p. 36.

lately put forth at Augsburg by committees appointed by the papal party, and has had the same considered by its theologians. We find that the document contains three classes of articles:

"First, those on which the Committee agreed, and which have not hitherto been the subject of controversy. These we now pass by.

"Secondly, those articles which have been hitherto the subjects of controversy, and have not yet been agreed upon. In regard to these it is right, Christian and proper, that those things should be firmly maintained which ours have publicly preached, and which they have set forth in the Confession as true and Christian.

"Thirdly, those articles, which in part are matters of doubt, and in part subjects of controversy.

"In regard to the controverted articles, or as quite recently they have been called, the doubtful articles, the Senate and its theologians, and beyond doubt other Christian people, are of the opinion that in that document much has been yielded, granted and conceded to the Papists, which either wounds the conscience, and cannot be sustained by Scripture, or which will bring evil and scandal upon those who have hitherto preferred Christ and his Gospel. Some of these articles and their objectionable features we will briefly indicate:

"First, it would be not a little inconvenient for pious rulers to obligate themselves and to agree to allow the monks, nuns, and cloisters to remain in their primitive condition, and to use the ceremonies that have been in vogue among them, for in many places it would follow that the old *Patrocinia,* preaching, impious Masses, fraternities, funeral rites, and many like things would be restored in the cloisters and would allure and seduce innocent people. And by the diversity of ceremonies, such confusion would be introduced, that among the common people, especially in large communities, nothing but constant sedition could be expected, to say nothing about the things arising from the same source, that would be silently tolerated.

"Secondly, it is not well, and it will in no small degree promote error, to concede to the Papists, as they have hitherto taught, that there are three parts in repentance. For there is no doubt that by Confession, the Papists mean auricular confession (Ohrenbeicht), and by satisfaction, the satisfaction of works. Now, let everyone consider, if these two parts be conceded to them as necessary parts of repentance, how much they would thereby gain: and let everyone consider whether the Word of God and

the Holy Scripture can allow this. Or should the matter be glossed and explained differently from what the Papists understand it, yet it will never be understood by the common people otherwise than according to the papal sense.

"Thirdly, if the communion is to be administered to no one who has not previously made oral confession, then the way will be opened for scruples and errors. But it would be perilous to bind the communion absolutely to confession, and to bind the people to confession. What would this be, except to bind the conscience again to oral confession, to which no one should be again bound by compulsion or necessity? This would also be to restore the papal torments, and it would force the people on the day of communion and at some particular time to confess at the whim of the pastors.

"Fourthly, the article about fasts, the eating and abstaining from flesh, is perfectly ridiculous and detrimental. For thus the people would be forced against their will again to observe quadragesimal and other festival days. Thus, Christian liberty, under the guise of maintaining peace and unity, would be destroyed. Christian liberty, as likewise every other article of faith, we ought to maintain, as Paul commands. Abandon Christian liberty, and institute necessity, and the Papists will have it all their own way.

"Fifthly, there is no Scripture to be found anywhere that teaches, or allows us to infer, that deceased saints, or the angels of heaven, pray to God for us. Also there is no mediator, intercessor, or high priest before God, as all Scripture shows, except Christ alone. What use is there, then, what advantage do all have, from conceding and yielding this article to the Papists, which they have tried to base on the Scriptures, but of which the Scriptures have not a trace? And every intelligent person knows well what abuses have followed gradually from this article.

"Sixthly, in this a larger jurisdiction has been granted and conceded to the Bishops than they themselves have hitherto ever demanded or have ever had. Should this article be established, then no more subtle and direct way of utterly wiping out the Gospel in a short time could be thought of. For if, as heretofore, the Bishops should have full power over the priests; if the Bishops, by virtue of their episcopal authority, are to be able, unhindered, to punish delinquent priests; if the pastors and priests are to be presented to the Bishops, as this article unqualifiedly proposes, without any limitation of the episcopal power, what else

will follow, or what is to be expected, except that the Bishops will never permit a truly Christian pastor to be presented? Or should they allow such an one to be presented, they will be forever making charges against him, or will be otherwise interfering with him, so that he cannot remain. Or what pastor would expose himself to such perils, or would preach, if there be no appeal to the rulers for protection against the Bishops, and if he had nothing but death and ruin to expect? How could the rulers answer before God and their own consciences for their subjects? But if the preachers should be thus harassed, arrested, persecuted, expelled, how long would the Gospel and the Christian religion remain? And how could the Papists offer a more subtle contrivance to the Christian Estates for deferring the articles, about which there is dispute, to a future council, than by having them accept this article of the Jurisdiction of the Bishops? For, in this way, they have hit upon a method and plan by which they can quickly overthrow the Gospel, together with the preachers and pastors, so that it can never again be defended, according to law and reason, against the Emperor, the Empire, and the allied Estates.

"Finally, such are the difficulties and objectionable features arising from several articles and from several passages in the document submitted. Should this document be accepted, consciences will be wounded, and a large part of the papal abuses will be confirmed, the Gospel will be held in contempt, the Evangelical Estates will be regarded as apostates, the Scriptures will be neglected, things will be done contrary to the Scriptures in many ways, and one evil will beget another." *

With additional words and arguments, the Nürnberg Senate remonstrates and warns against the concessions that had been made, and further points out the evil consequences that must result from a reunion on such a basis. In a word, the "*Judicium et Censura*" is a clear and pronounced condemnation of the Articles of Agreement made by the Committee of Fourteen. The Evangelical consciousness of the Nürnbergers has been fairly outraged. Hence, this remonstrance, which is one of the noblest testimonies of that age of noble testimonies to the truth. Its effect upon the Elector and the Margrave cannot be questioned.

4. *Other Remonstrances.*

1. Dr. Geryon Seiler, of Augsburg, an ardent friend of the

* German in Chytraeus (1577), p. 173 *et seqq.*; Latin in Coelestin, III., 81 *et seqq.*, and in Chytraeus, pp. 297 *et seqq.*

Reformation, hearing of the concessions that had been made by the Protestant Committee, wrote a most earnest and trenchant letter to Spalatin, about August 20th or 21st. We can give only the salient points:

(a) In the proscription of marriage to the priests "the Evangelicals have not considered the interest of Christ and his kingdom, but their own interest."

(b) If the communion is to be received under one species only, "why has it been so bitterly contended that communion under one species is contrary to the Gospel?" "If for the sake of peace one species is to be conceded, then for the sake of peace neither species ought to be taken."

(c) "Though the Mass is a memorial sacrifice, yet the Canon would have to be tolerated, and the words oblation, host, sacrifice would have to be understood not as of a memorial." He insists on the removal of the Canon of the Mass, because it introduces a mode of worship that is contrary to the Word of God. "Would not all Lutherans and Evangelicals cry out that those things have now been brought to ruin that were hitherto preached by the Leaders? Such union would be like drawing a cloud over the sun. You say this must be endured for the sake of peace. Paul did not so love peace as to circumcise Titus and Timothy. He circumcised the one out of deference to the weak, but he refused to circumcise the other when he saw that it would bring prejudice to the faith. But the Papists are not weak. Rather are they blind. Hence they are to be allowed to go. But if concord should be effected on these conditions, not peace, but the greatest commotion and many perils would follow."

By such and similar arguments Dr. Seiler opposes the course taken by the Lutherans, and insists that "such remedies will not heal the disease, but will make it worse." *

2. Lazarus Spengler, Secretary to the Nürnberg Senate, was one of the noblest spirits of the age, a thorough Protestant, and one of Luther's most devoted friends. On or about August 26th he wrote a letter to Augsburg that is full of warning and of expressions of dissatisfaction with the concessions made by the Protestant portion of the Committee of Fourteen. He does not propose to judge the Articles from the standpoint of the theologian; but he declares that he "cannot regard them as harmless, as safe for the conscience, and without injury to the glory of God." It is especially offensive to him to hear it said in the

* Förstemann, II., 286 *et seqq.*

matter of the Private Masses, "We cannot help it." He answers thus: "There is a difference between not being able to help a thing and approving it. If it be beyond my power to prevent a thing that I regard as wrong, and it come to pass, then before God and my conscience I am innocent. But if I approve a thing that is wrong, which, as one in authority, I might hinder or prevent, or not allow, with what kind of conscience can I answer before God, before my subjects and before the whole world?" He was most indignant that in such grave matters neither Luther nor the allies of the Evangelical cause had been consulted. He says: "Everyone must confess that Dr. Martin Luther is the one through whom, as His instrument, God Almighty has preached and published his word in Germany, and that up to his time he has been the leader and standard-bearer in this valiant transaction. Now, in my opinion, it is wholly improper to allow him, the originator and leader in those matters, the most learned and experienced theologian in Germany, to be ignored, and that these articles should not be submitted to him before they are delivered and approved. Are we to suppose that Luther is so puerile and cowardly that, should anything injurious and offensive be decided on behind his back, he would sit still and say nothing, and affect that what we had resolved on pleased him? . . .

"I fear this: Because we regard the Princes at Augsburg as our champions in matters of faith, and have looked up to them and have entrusted so much to them, God may in this way show us what it is to trust more to men than to Him. I do not suspect Philip Melanchthon of having done anything that is impious and un-Christian, because I have hitherto regarded him, and still regard him, as a wise, learned, pious and honorable man. Neither shall this transaction cause me to suspect him of having done anything so entirely reprehensible. For I consider that he is too pious knowingly to approve a thing that is against his conscience and contrary to the Gospel. But consider that Melanchthon has not had the experience of Luther. He has not yet been violently attacked as Luther has been. He is too unsophisticated for those cunning, unscrupulous court-knaves. He has also not yet learned the devil as is necessary in dealing with such people. It may be that in cases where the fundamentals are preserved, his love of temporal peace would lead him to yield and to consent, where Luther, or another, would do otherwise." *

* Pressel's *Lazarus Spengler*, p. 72.

3. The Lüneburgers, the Hessians and the legates of the Evangelical cities were, as we have already indicated, violently hostile to the concessions that had been made by the Lutheran Seven, and especially were they displeased with the agreement to restore the full authority of the Bishops. We do not, indeed, have any written protest or remonstrance from the parties named above, but we have contemporaneous accounts that report their "great displeasure," and the earnest contentions they had with the Saxons, and their expressed unwillingness that anything more should be conceded.*

Melanchthon himself tells us that one of the Nürnberg legates, Baumgartner, had written him that had he (Melanchthon) been hired by the Roman Pope, he could not have undertaken a better method of reinstating the papal domination than that which had been proposed.† And John Brentz reports that the populace actually charged that the Lutheran portion of the Committee had been corrupted by papal gold, while those who were better disposed called the measures proposed "impious," and accused the Lutheran Seven with defection because they restored the episcopal jurisdiction.‡

The whole situation is described by Hieronymus Baumgartner, of Nürnberg, in a private letter to Lazarus Spengler: "Dear Mr. Secretary: I cannot refrain from informing you confidentially how I regard the transactions of the Diet, in so far as they have reference to the faith.

"First. You know from what has transpired how our party has been already solicited and urged, now by one devil and now by another, who clothe themselves in pleasing forms, yea, at times appear and act as angels of light. The opposite party has not indeed accomplished its purpose, and the proposals made by ours have not been accepted, yet we find that the present intention is to report these proposals in the Recess as approved. And although this has not yet occurred, yet they do nothing in vain, but are always wringing some concessions from us. These concessions they hold on to, and will use them when our distress is the greatest. But God, by special grace, has appointed that the Confession has been delivered; otherwise our theologians would make a very different confession, as they would gladly do, if we would follow them, though they do not agree with each other.

* See letter of Bernhard Besserer, of Ulm, in Kolde's *Analecta Lutherana*, p. 148; C. R. II., 313; Schirrmacher, pp. 242, 243; Coelestin, III., 58*b*.

† C. R. II., 336.

‡ C. R. II., 337, 338.

Philip has become more childish than a child. Brentz is not only destitute of tact, but is coarse and rude. Haller is full of fear. These three misled the pious Margrave, and made him pusillanimous. They persuade him to do what they wish, though I observe that he wants to do right. The pious Vogler must have it said of him in his absence: If he were yet here so much that is good and pacific could not have been accomplished. In these negotiations the Elector has no one more sagacious than Dr. Brück. But he has been so influenced that now even he acts with hesitation, because he has no one to stand by him. For the other Saxon theologians dare not say a word publicly against Philip, or he is aroused, and replies, as lately he did to the Chancellor of Lüneburg: If anybody dares to say that the proposals made are not Christian he lies like a villain. Whereupon he was answered: If anyone says the contrary, etc. Besides, those who act in a courageous and Christian manner are unceasingly slandered in every way, as we were witnesses in regard to the Hessians, who in these matters have conducted themselves most uprightly and honorably.

"In a word: So soon as we reject some harsh and ungracious decision of the Emperor, they try so to entangle us as to have us give up the favor of God without getting that of the Emperor. It has continued to be the case that whenever the Princes are together, someone comes to the Elector and tells him what he honestly and sincerely thinks of matters, etc., and says that if some concessions be made in this or that part, etc., matters can be mended. Then comes Philip with his articles and explanations. Meanwhile these are reported to the Margrave by Heller and Brentz. If we refuse the broth they have concocted, their theologians run round and say that we will not allow peace (as though peace could be made by our concessions), and wish to act in concert with the Landgrave, whom they have outrageously slandered." *

There can be no doubt that this picture is painted in striking colors and is somewhat overdrawn; but that in its main features it is true to the life, is made sufficiently evident by numerous letters and reports written by other hands. Baumgartner, who was one of Nürnberg's legates to the Diet, was too intelligent and experienced a man not to be able to comprehend the situation, and too honorable to wish to misrepresent it, though the intensity of his convictions may have led him into slight hyper-

* C. R. II., pp. 363, 364.

bole. At any rate, the situation was a most distressing one. It cannot be denied that the feet of the Saxons and the Margravians had slipped back almost into the ways of Rome. Neither can it be denied that it is due preëminently to the Nürnberg, Lüneburg and Hessian laymen that the reactionary movement set in, which, in its consummation, saved the day at Augsburg. For these laymen, as official and private documents demonstrate, not only resisted the making of further concessions, but criticised and condemned those that had been made in the Committee of Fourteen. Even Melanchthon himself has conceded as much. In a letter to Luther, written September 4th, he says: "Our allies are manifestly playing the Elbe. Hence I am strengthened in the conviction that we ought to make peace. The Nürnberg legates and the Hessians do not keep within bounds, and the Lüneburgers agree with them. Ours think that no opportunity of making peace, provided it be honorably made, ought to be lost." *

The general effect of such protests, remonstrances and criticisms, as we have reproduced in the preceding pages, upon the Saxons and the Margravians, was at once to arrest progress in the way of concessions and to turn their faces to the surer foundation which had been established in the Confession. Hence we find that the Lutheran Three in the Joint Committee of Six were far more steadfast than were the Lutheran Seven, although the Three had been a part of the Seven.

5. *The Climax.*

Copies of the Articles of Agreement, proposed by the two halves of the Committee of Fourteen, were promptly sent to Luther by the Elector of Saxony, with the request that he render an opinion on them.† Melanchthon wrote to Luther, August 22d, and gave him the chief points in the negotiations.‡ Luther replied August 26th. His letter to the Elector is a masterful *exposé* of the poison, deceit and danger that lie concealed in the aforesaid Articles. As this letter shows how clearly Luther comprehended the situation at Augsburg, and how firmly he maintained his position against the chief corruptions of the Roman Catholic Church, and as it is one of the most important and effective productions of his pen, we give it in full:

"Grace and peace in Christ, Illustrious High-born Prince, Most Gracious Elector and Lord:

* C. R. II., 350. † Coelestin, III., 52*a*. ‡ C. R. II., 299.

"I have received your letter, together with copies from both parts of the Committee. Now, inasmuch as Your Grace desires my opinion on the same, I will herewith obediently render it.

"The conditions and methods proposed by them, and accepted by ours, are by no means to be tolerated; and I am supremely astonished that such things should have been proposed. As regards the Articles from our side, this is my judgment: When our opponents desire us to teach that one form of the Sacrament is right, and that it shall not be enjoined, but left free to use one or both forms, Your Grace knows very well that it is our chief contention that nothing must be taught, or done, that is not clearly in accord with God's Word; lest, as Paul says, we run in vain and beat the air. We have trouble enough, even when we go according to and abide by the sure Word. It is certain that the doctrine about one form of the Sacrament is a pure human invention, and is not at all supported by the Word of God. But, on the contrary, the use of both forms is established by the clear words of God. Hence, we cannot either approve or teach that the use of one form is right. For there stands Christ, Matt. 15: 9: *Ye serve me with the doctrines of men.*

"Besides, in using only one form, we treat the words of Christ with indifference, where he so heartily and earnestly enjoins, *Do this in remembrance of me.* Even they themselves do not believe that it is a matter of indifference. For, on account of this, they have burned, hounded, persecuted many, and have condemned it as a great heresy. Hence, not only on God's account, and our own, but for their sake, we must not allow that it is a matter of indifference. We must regard them as murderers and scoundrels, since, forsooth, they have persecuted and condemned an indifferent thing as a heresy. They themselves do not believe that it is a matter of indifference. Much less can we so teach. Let them recall and bring back all they have persecuted for this cause. It is a very fine complaint they make, viz., that they cannot hold the people where we do not preach that they are right. I am delighted to hear such a wise reason. It is as though God must not allow his Word to be preached in order that they may hold their people and remain tyrants.

"Of Private Masses, I say the same: They are the invention of men, are without support from God's Word, and are an abuse. Our opponents do not strive to compel us to restore these, but only not to forbid them. We do not prevent such, but cannot approve them. If one human invention be admitted, then another

must be admitted. That is the way it goes. If we allow the Private Masses, then forthwith we must drop the Gospel and accept a human invention; for there is no reason why one and not all human inventions should be received. To forbid and to condemn all is to forbid and condemn one.

"They pretend that it is not the function of rulers to prevent such things. They know very well that the office of ruling and the office of the ministry are not one and the same, and that Princes have nothing to do with such things. But the question is whether a Prince, as a Christian, will approve this, and not whether he act as a Prince. Whether a Prince should preach, and whether he should approve preaching, are different matters. It is not the Prince, but the Scripture, that disapproves of Private Masses. It is in the power of the Prince to say whether he will allow the Scriptures or not. No man on earth can force him to do it.

"Should the Canon be allowed with a proper interpretation? Yes, provided it be placed in the hands of safe expounders.. Long ago, I might have undertaken to explain the religion of the Turks, and to reduce all kinds of unbelief to the Christian faith. It is well known that they have sold Masses as a sacrifice and a work. Now they would explain them. In a word, it is human invention, such as cannot be tolerated in the affairs of God. Besides, it is dangerous and vexatious. And, since they do not abstain from Private Masses, and do not agree with us in regard to the Mass, viz., that it is not a sacrifice, why do they wish to retain the offensive word, seeing that it is unnecessary and dangerous? We do not unnecessarily expose ourselves to danger, for this is forbidden, and it is to tempt God. St. Augustine says: *Maintain* the doctrine, but correct the language. Speaking of fate, he says: He that understands fate as the decree of God, understands it aright. Yet he will not tolerate the Word, but says: *Correct the language.* Shall we adopt an obscure and uncertain word, when we find it hard to maintain those that are clear and plain?

"And what advantage is there in retaining the word *sacrifice* in the Canon? The Canon so plainly declares the Mass to be a true sacrifice, that no man can explain or understand it otherwise. For, it is stated, that God, by the hand of his angel, will have such a sacrifice of the Mass brought up before the Holy Altar. This cannot be explained as meaning a memorial of the sufferings of Christ, for this must be done by preaching. In a word,

in the Canon the prayer is made that God will accept this sacrifice, since it is the body and blood of His dear Son, as though a man must intercede for Christ with God. That is blasphemous and infamous. Hence, the Canon is not to be tolerated.

"Finally. We will suffer everything and make concessions so far as that is in our power. But, we pray that they will not demand of us what is not in our power. But, it is not in our power to accept anything contrary to God's Word; and it is not in our power to accept a form of worship that is contrary to God's Word. Fasts and festivals instituted by men we can accept as far as they have been established by the civil government, as a civil ordinance; for all such things belong to the secular power, which is adorned with ceremonies, robes, gestures, fasts and festivals. Such things God subordinated to reason, and has enjoined that they be treated as optional matters. Gen. 2. They are earthly things, and their nature is earthly, and they are all subordinated to reason, as Paul said: *Rule over the earth.* Now, inasmuch as the civil government is the highest work of reason, it can act and command in these matters.

"Such is my answer given in haste to Your Princely Grace's inquiries. I commend Your Princely Grace to the favor of God.
"Friday after Bartholomew (August 26th) anno 1530.

"Obediently,

"Martin Luther, D."*

On the same day, Luther wrote to Spalatin as follows: "I learn that you somewhat reluctantly have begun a marvelous work, namely, the reconciliation of the Pope and Luther. But the Pope refuses, and Luther begs to be excused. Take care lest your labor be in vain. If you succeed against the will of both of us, then I will follow your example, and will reconcile Christ and Beliel."†

On the same day, he answered Melanchthon's letter of 22d, as follows:

"Grace and peace in Christ: If the matter was to end in this way, My Philip, I am astonished that they could tolerate, and could treat of the matter in a friendly way. Is there not indeed guile and treachery there? You now have to do with Cochlaeus with the Archbishop of Salzburg, and with those ghostly monks who were rowed across the Rhine at Speyer.‡ What is there that

* De Wette, *Luther's Briefe,* IV., 140-143.
† De Wette, IV., 144.
‡ *Historia de Spectris Spirensibus.* Schirrmacher, 194-196.

I have ever less expected, less desired, than to negotiate for agreement in doctrine? It would be like driving out the Pope, or as though our doctrine and the papacy could be conserved together. There is the semblance of a treaty, and of an alliance, in order that the Pope may remain. He is willing to concede and to permit, provided we obey. But, thanks to God, you have not accepted these things.

"You write that you forced Eck to confess that we are justified by faith. Would that you had forced him not to lie. Eck, forsooth, confesses that there is the righteousness of faith. But, meanwhile the papacy defends every kind of abomination, kills, prosecutes, and condemns those who profess the doctrine of faith; and instead of repenting, it goes on. The same is done by the entire party of the adversaries. Seek for terms of concord with these people (si Christo placet), and toil in vain until they get a chance to destroy us.

"What you write in regard to both species is correct. I agree with you that it is not a matter of indifference, but a command to take both species if we wish to take the sacrament. In the Church of God, and in the worship of God, we cannot arbitrarily either institute or tolerate what cannot be defended by the Word of God, and I am not a little annoyed by this sacrilegious word indifferent. Admit one thing in the Word of God to be indifferent, how will you hinder everything from becoming indifferent? They cry and vociferate that we condemn the entire Church. We say that the Church has been led captive, and has been oppressed by the tyranny of one species, and hence it is to be excused, just as the entire synagogue in Babylon was excused, because it could not observe the law of Moses in ecclesiastical rites and in its sacraments, as it could in Jerusalem. Now, did they cease to be the people of God, because, as captives and forbidden, they did not observe the rites enjoined upon them? But Eck wants himself and his to be proclaimed the Church. We, on the contrary, say that we do not condemn the entire Church, but that in mutilating the sacrament, they condemn the entire Word of God (which is more than the Church).

"As touching the rendering of obedience to the Bishops, and as touching jurisdiction and common ceremonies, as you write, see that you do not yield more than you have yielded, lest, in defending the Gospel, we be forced to a more difficult and dangerous war. I know you have always made an exception of the Gospel in these agreements, but I fear that hereafter they

will charge that we are perfidious and fickle if we do not do as they wish. They will accept concessions *large, largius, largissime,* and will make their own *stricte, strictius, strictissime.*

"In a word, I am out-and-out displeased with the *tractatus de doctrinae concordia,* since such is plainly impossible, unless the Pope is willing to put away his popery. Was it not enough that we gave account of our faith, and seek peace? Why should we expect to convert them to the truth? We came for the purpose of learning whether or not they would approve our position, but willing to allow them to remain what they are. We inquire, Will they condemn or will they approve? If they condemn, what profit is there in wishing to try to have agreement with enemies? If they approve, what need is there to wish to retain the old abuses? But, since it is certain that we are condemned by them, and that they do not repent, but try to retain their own affairs, why do we not understand that all that they attempt is deceit and lies? For you cannot say that their affairs proceed from the Holy Spirit, since such things are destitute of repentance, of faith, of piety. But the Lord, who began this work in us, will perfect it. To him I heartily commend you. August 26th, 1530.

"Martin Luther." *

Luther wrote also the same day to Justus Jonas: "Grace and peace: I have seen and read the decisions of yours as touching our cause. What I wrote to Philip, that I write to you, namely, that in fealty to Christ, and for my sake, as I am a Christian, you and all ours believe that Campeggius is one big, notorious devil. Words cannot express how vehemently I am excited about those terms proposed by the other party, so that the demons are ridiculing and mocking our cause. This is the trick of Campeggius and of the Pope, first to try our cause by violence and threats, and if this does not succeed, then to assail it with treachery. You have experienced violence and threats, and you bore the terrible advent of the Emperor. Now you are bearing treachery and those ghostly monks that were rowed across the Rhine at Speyer. That is, they are proposing harmony in doctrine. This is a mystery indeed. What but violence and deceit could you expect from the father of deceit and lies, the author of death and violence? But he who gave you power to overcome violence, will give you grace and strength to overcome deceit. Of

* De Wette, IV., 145.

these things I have written to the Prince and to Philip. The messenger must return in haste. Quit ye like men. Don't trust the adversaries, except they prove their position by plain Scripture. The Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen. From the Hermitage, August 26th, 1530.

"MARTIN LUTHER." *

In these four letters, Luther employs argument, irony, sarcasm, denunciation, in order to express his opposition to the Articles proposed for the reunion of the Catholics and Lutherans. He simply will not tolerate the Articles. They are an abomination to him. They are in conflict with the fundamental principles of the Gospel. It is Luther *versus* the Pope; it is the Word of God *versus* the institutions of man; it is Christ *versus* Beliel. There could be no reconciliation along such lines. The point of contact was wanting. And as evidence of Luther's abiding and growing opposition to the Articles of Agreement, we have his letters of August 28th to Spalatin, Melanchthon and Jonas, in which he warns in the strongest language against the wiles of the enemy and against the making of further concessions.† About the same time, he wrote an "Opinion," ‡ in which he instructs his colleagues at Augsburg about concessions to the enemy. As touching the doctrinal Articles of the Confession, nothing is to be yielded, inasmuch as such Articles are founded on Holy Scripture, and have not been refuted by the adversaries. He then takes up the various subjects contained in the Articles on Abuses.

In the matter of both species in the Eucharist, he declares that nothing can be conceded, since no man can change an institution of God, neither, "can we teach in our churches that those do not sin, nor act contrary to the command of God, who either administer or receive only one species." "The marriage of the priests we neither can nor ought to prohibit, since it was instituted, appointed and confirmed by God." "We cannot allow Private Mass to be restored or to be celebrated in our churches, since everybody knows that it is an idolatry and an abuse." "We distinctly declare that we cannot receive and approve either the Small or the Large Canon, since in express terms they make of the Mass a work by which grace and the remission of sins are bestowed *ex opere operato* upon the priest and upon the lay wor-

* De Wette, IV., 147, 148.
†De Wette, IV., 155-158.
‡ *Erl. Ausg.*, 65: 46 *et seqq.*

shiper.'' He is willing that the cloister people shall remain in the cloisters and have food and shelter, but their Masses and their ungodly manner of life shall not be tolerated. He thinks that the episcopal jurisdiction might be allowed, provided the Bishops will not seek to persecute and to exterminate the Lutheran teaching. Meats and festivals cannot be allowed to burden the conscience.

The ''Opinion,'' of which we have presented only the salient features, is a trenchant criticism of the concessions made by the Protestants in the Committee of Fourteen. It shows that its author is out-and-out opposed to making any more concessions than had been already made in the Confession; and his reasons for rejecting the Abuses are even stronger and clearer than those given in the Confession itself. Luther, who had taken no active part in the preparation of the Confession after April 22d, and who in the earlier days of the Diet had been little more than an interested spectator, and who for much of the time had been neglected or ignored, has now stepped to the front and has assumed command of the Lutheran forces at Augsburg and begins to determine their movements. He speaks as dictator and prophet. This is shown in a letter written by him to Lazarus Spengler of Augsburg: ''I have commended the cause to God, and have it so well in hand that no man can force me to yield anything, nor can I be deserted so long as Christ and I are one. For though too much has been conceded (for this I was not prepared), yet the cause is not lost, but a new conflict has been begun in which our opponents will be convinced that they have acted dishonorably. For, besides and beyond the Gospel, nothing can be conceded, whoever holds the field by guile. For, in maintaining the Gospel, it is very different from what our opponents allege against us, because what is the wisdom of man as against God? Therefore, let your heart be at peace. We will concede nothing against the Gospel. But, if ours concede anything contrary to the Gospel, then shall the devil take that party. That shall you see. August 28th, anno 1530.

''Martin Luther, D.'' *

But while Luther's letters of August 26th were speeding post-haste from Coburg to Augsburg, new negotiations for peace were proposed. The Catholics were not satisfied with the Lutheran

* De Wette, IV., 158.

Reply of August 28th. Hence, the next evening, August 29th, Duke Henry of Brunswick, the Bishop of Liege, and Count Hoyer, of Mansfeld, took supper with the Elector of Saxony. The Duke and others, in speeches, not all of which were seasoned with grace, insisted on the appointment of a new committee to take the matter of reunion under final advisement.* The Lutherans considered the proposition the next day and rejected it.†

For a week or more, there had been a growing dissatisfaction with the concessions that had been made, and a growing determination to make no additional concessions to the Catholics, and a growing unwillingness to engage with them in further negotiations on the subject of reunion. "Besides, on that day came Luther's answer, and that gave the casting vote,"‡ or as another has said: "Turned the scale, 'as a freeing from evil enchantment.'" All honor to the clear eye and to the brave heart of Martin Luther. He saw the danger from afar, and from afar he gave the alarm. His followers now recoil from the

* Schirrmacher, 248; Coelestin, III., 61*a*.

† C. R. II., 334.

‡ Dr. H. Virck, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. X., 312. (1) Already on the morning of the 29th, Luther's answer was expected (C. R. II., 322, 327). Written on the 26th, it could easily have reached Augsburg on the evening of the 29th or on the morning of the 30th, since "the messenger must return in haste." De Wette, IV., 147-8. (2) The next day the Elector asked permission to return home. This he would scarcely have done had he not been convinced by Luther's answer of the futility of any further negotiations. (3) The promptness and decisiveness manifested in rejecting the proposition of the Catholics show the presence of a new influence. (4) Seckendorf says distinctly: "It seemed good to the Protestants, strengthened by Luther's letters, to abstain from that deceitful negotiation for concord." Lib. II., § LXXV.; and Maurenbrecker says: "In my opinion Luther's letters of August 26th to the Elector John, Spalatin, Melanchthon, Justus Jonas and Brentz (De Wette, IV., 140-145) were undoubtedly the deciding factors." (*Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation,* p. 411.) (5) On the morning of the 29th Melanchthon informs Luther that his answer has not yet been received (C. R. II., 327). September 1st he informs him: "Day before yesterday (August 30th) our conference came to an end. For we were not willing to accept the terms in regard to one part of the Sacrament, the Canon, Private Masses, and Celibacy." (C. R. II., 336.) See also Enders (*Briefwechsel Luther's,* vol. 8: 216, 239), who says: "This letter, as likewise the following of August 26th, came to Augsburg on the 30th." Bernhard Besserer, in his letter to Ulm, August 24th, says that a letter has been received from Luther, which shows that he has become "perfectly furious" over the situation at Augsburg. Such a Luther letter as Besserer describes is not extant, but that such a letter had been received at Augsburg, cannot be doubted. Besserer's letter, which only recently has been published, throws much light on the situation at Augsburg just after the dissolution of the Committee of Fourteen. It is given by Kolde in *Analecta Lutherana,* pp. 148-9. The letter declares that there is great dissatisfaction among the Evangelicals with the concessions that had been made in the Committee.

brink of the precipice to which the *insidiae* of their enemies and their own *imbecilitas animi* had led them.

Hence, the language in which their final decision is recorded shows a marked change of sentiment and a marked difference in tone.* On the morning of 29th, the Elector of Saxony had "graciously heard" the Nürnberg Remonstrance, and, as we have learned, had promised that he would make no more concessions. And now, when Luther's letters came, the change was made complete. In the face of the most strenuous opposition from their most devoted allies, and in view of Luther's emphatic rejection of the Articles of Agreement, it would have been morally impossible for the Saxons and the Margravians to have continued this solemn farce with the Catholics, in which, if it can be said that the Catholic Seven played a subtle and deceitful part, it can be said also that the Lutheran Seven did not play a manly and courageous part. They did not stand firmly by all the doctrines and principles enunciated in their Confession. It is sad to reflect that in the negotiations almost everything is made to turn finally on subjects which the Confession itself had treated as "Abuses." The so-called doctrinal articles —*Articuli fidei Praecipui*—of the Confession seems to have dropped quite out of sight; at least they are not held in the Small Committee as a ground of difference and as a sufficient reason for separation. One may be thankful that in the long contention of over two months, so much that is fundamental to Protestantism was saved; but it would have been a thousand times better had the Lutherans, both in their Confession, and in the subsequent negotiations, given a clearer, a sharper statement of the distinctive evangelical *doctrines*, and had made a more valiant defense of those doctrines, as Luther, Melanchthon and others, had enunciated and defended them in their private writings. Nevertheless, the Augsburg Confession, as it was subsequently edited by its author and published, and as it was explained in the Apology, in the *Loci Communes*, in the *Repetition* (1551) and in many *Opinions*, and as it was defended by its author and others in diets and in colloquies, became, and is to-day, the great evangelical bulwark against Rome, both in doctrine and in practice. It is the fundamental Creed of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and is the only distinctive Creed

* See Schirrmacher, p. 147; Coelestin, III., 61*a*; Sleidan (Eng. Trans.), p. 132; Spalatin, 190; C. R. II., 320.

that has had universal recognition in the Lutheran Church. Therefore, it is the Creed of Lutheran Catholicity.

But, with the action of the Lutherans on August 30th, the negotiations for union and concord came practically to a close. The crisis is now past. The opposition that had set in when the concessions of the Lutheran Seven became known, and Luther's letters, had forced the Saxons and the Margravians back beyond the point of danger, and had brought them to a better understanding with their more steadfast allies. Melanchthon, indeed, still longs and sighs for peace and reconciliation, and some of the Catholics make fresh proposals and desire to continue negotiations; but all in vain. The Lutherans as a body remain firm, and reply that they can concede no more than had been conceded, and that they will rest the matter with God and a good conscience.* Luther continues to exhort his friends to steadfastness, while the Elector of Saxony insists on taking his leave of the Diet. Finally, September 22d, the Lutherans offer to read their Apology of the Augsburg Confession.† The next day, the Elector of Saxony, accompanied by his illustrious chancellors and by his theologians, left Augsburg. His example was followed the same evening by the Dukes of Lüneburg and the Prince of Anhalt, and on the next day by the legates of Reutlingen, Heilbron and Kempten.

Practically, the Diet of Augsburg was now brought to a close. Further negotiations and conferences could make no essential change, for the chief Lutheran leaders had departed from Augsburg. The work for which they had gone thither, namely, to defend themselves against false accusations, and to sue for peace had been done. The Augsburg Confession—confession and apology in one—had passed into history; the reunion efforts had come to naught; the Catholics and the Lutherans were further apart at the close of the Diet than they had been at its beginning. All subsequent efforts to reunite them have failed. Their fundamental principles are different. Lutheranism is based on the Word of God. Catholicism is based on the authority of the Church. Lutheranism holds that the institutions of men have no dominion over the conscience. Catholicism holds that the institutions of the Church bind the conscience as conditions of

* Spalatin, p. 190.

† August 29th, Melanchthon was commissioned to write the Apology. Schirrmacher, p. 530; Plitt, *Apologie*, p. 87. This shows that the Lutherans had decided to discontinue negotiations.

salvation. Lutheranism teaches that the Confession itself is open to revision and to improvement in statement.* Catholicism pronounces an anathema on all who reject her canons and decrees.†

* See Bishop von Scheele's *Symbolik*, pp. v. and 31, in Part First, and pp. 80, 81 in Part Second.
† See Council of Trent, *Passim*.

CHAPTER XIII.

LUTHER'S RELATIONS TO THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

During the dogmatic era of the Lutheran Church it was quite the custom among the Gnesio-Lutherans, as indicated in Chapter II., to speak of Luther as the chief author of the Augsburg Confession. The reasons given for this judgment were, that Luther, at the request and with the approval of his Wittenberg colleagues, had composed seventeen doctrinal articles, and about March 20th had carried the same to Torgau, on account of which they were called the Torgau Articles; that out of these Torgau Articles Melanchthon arranged the Confession; that "Luther suggested, digested, and prescribed the material out of which the Confession was woven;" that he directed and controlled all the theological deliberations at Augsburg, and that nothing was done at Augsburg without his consent.*

It is needless to say that in the main these reasons are fictions and fancies, and not facts, and they would not be noticed here but for the fact that half a century and more ago some Lutheran theologians in Germany, and some in America, writing and contending more in support of a confessional prepossession than in the interest of historical science, have revived the old contention. But historical criticism, conducted in the interest of historical science, has settled the question of the authorship of the Augsburg Confession, and has determined the extent of Luther's influence in the composition of the said Confession. As all the chief facts were given in Chapter II., it may suffice to say here that Luther knew absolutely nothing about the change of the Apology into a Confession of faith until he received the copy of the first draft sent him by the Elector on the eleventh of May. After this he did not see the Confession in any form until he received the copy sent him by Melanchthon, June 26th.

1. *The Long Silence.*

In this interval occurred a long silence in which Luther heard nothing from Augsburg. That there was a long period of silence,

* See John Wigand, *Historia de Augsb. Confessione*, Cyprian, p. 123. Calovius, *Exegema, Cap.*, II. Boerner, *Institutiones Symb. Theol.*, pp. 32, 33.

and that Luther bitterly complained of it, cannot be questioned. June 19th he wrote to Dydimus, of Torgau: "For an entire month ours have reported nothing from Augsburg."* On the twentieth he wrote to Jonas: "At last your letter has come, My Jonas, after that for fully three weeks you have well tormented us with unbroken silence, though I wrote Philip twice that you should not thus be silent. Had it not been for the circumstance of the times I should have thought of revenge. But the time of prayer does not permit to be angry, and anger does not permit prayer. Nevertheless I have taken care to render you notorious, especially at Wittenberg. You cannot blame the messengers. They faithfully delivered, especially the one hired by you. From the time when he delivered yours, I have received nothing except this last one about the coming and the entrance of the Emperor, and yesterday about your complaints. But I will avenge this at the right time."† Messenger after messenger came to Coburg, but they brought no letters for Luther, and he began to suspect that the Lutherans at Augsburg were concealing something from him.‡ Finally, when letters did come, he was so angry that he would not read them.§ Melanchthon and Jonas tried to throw the blame on the letter-carriers, but Luther indignantly replied: "It is not the fault of the carrier. It is your fault and yours only, but may Christ by his Spirit forgive you and strengthen and teach you." ||

Dr. Knaake says: "Melanchthon's silence extends over the entire time from May 22d to June 15th."¶ Köstlin says: "Luther remained without a letter for four weeks."** Plitt says: "For three weeks long he (Luther) heard nothing from Augsburg."†† And Kolde: "He (Luther) had every reason to be angry, since at one time his friends in Augsburg left him for three weeks without any news. Even Jonas, who wrote him about things of small importance, regularly forgot to say how matters stood with the Evangelicals and with the Evangelical Confession. The Augsburgers tried in vain to shift the blame upon the faithful carriers. Luther knew that they really had not written."‡‡ As the letters of Melanchthon and Jonas were sent by a special messenger, they probably reached Coburg May 26th. From that time on to June 20th Luther received no news from

* De Wette, IV., 44.
† De Wette, IV., 45.
‡ De Wette, IV., 60.
§ C. R. II., 141.
|| De Wette, IV., 50.
¶ Luther's *Antheil*, p. 51.
** *Martin Luther*, II., 655.
†† *D. Martin Luther*, p. 369.
‡‡ *Martin Luther*, II., 339.

Augsburg; that is, for about twenty-five days. "The messenger was innocent and Luther's complaint was well founded," says Kawerau.*

These facts show to what extent Luther directed and shaped the course of events at Augsburg, and to what extent he exerted an influence in the composition of the Augsburg Confession, in which Melanchthon was daily making changes by recasting articles, by omitting the Preface, by adding articles and giving new shape and coloring to the entire Confession. And it was during that long period of silence especially that the principal changes were made. The draft sent to Luther, May 11th, was gradually becoming the finished Confession without any knowledge of the fact on the part of Luther, and without a single word of advice or suggestion from him, so that instead of being now the Confession of the Elector of Saxony it had become the Common Confession of the Lutheran Princes assembled at Augsburg. Of all these changes, we repeat, Luther knew nothing at all, except what may be gathered from the slight notification contained in Melanchthon's letter of May 22d: "We are daily making changes." Hence Luther cannot be held responsible for the finished Confession. He had given his approval to the first draft, but to no more. From May 22d to June 25th he was written to, by the Elector June 1st, by Jonas June 12th and 13th, by Melanchthon June 13th, by Jonas June 18th, by Melanchthon June 19th. But not one of these letters informs him of the work that is being done on the Confession, or inquires for his opinion, or asks his advice about the Confession-Apology that is the subject of so much care and activity at Augsburg. And of the letters written by Luther from Coburg to his friends, April 23d to June 29th, in so far as they have come down to us, eighteen in number, only one, that of May 15th, to the Elector, makes any reference to the Confession. All the others are as silent about the Confession as though such a thing had never existed. But what is the most remarkable of all is the fact that Luther never wrote a line to Melanchthon about the "Apology"

* *Jonas, Briefwechsel*, I., p. 160 *n.* Professor Credner calls attention to the fact that Luther nowhere and never laid the weight on the Augsburg Confession that he laid on Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, nor spoke of it as he spoke of that book. "The chief weight," says Credner, "that Luther laid on the Augsburg Confession arose from the fact that by it, in a great assembly of the Empire, the overwhelming proof was furnished that *the doctrines and Articles of Faith, in which the Evangelicals differ from the Catholics, are not contrary to the Holy Scripture.* The chief passage is found in his *Warning to his beloved Germans*, Jena ed., V., fol. 280 *et seqq.*" *Exörterungen Kirchlicher Zeitfragen*, 1848, p. 109.

until after June 25th, though Melanchthon three times, May 4th, 11th, 22d, gave Luther information about the "Apology" and at least furnished Luther the opportunity to write him about it.

Such are the facts, and they show to a demonstration that from May 2d to June 25th, Luther's influence at Augsburg was small indeed. Within that period he was not the inspirer and director of the movements at Augsburg. For three full weeks, or more, he was left in total ignorance of what was going on there. For more than four weeks he was not informed in regard to the daily changes that were made in the "Apology."

And yet, it is not intended by this recital of facts to intimate that Luther exerted no influence at Augsburg within these dates. He prayed for his friends at Augsburg, and exhorted them, especially the Elector and Melanchthon, to steadfastness. But this he did much more *after* June 25th than he did before that time, as his letters show.* It was not until he had read the copy of the Confession sent him by Melanchthon, June 26th, and was asked what further concessions were to be made,† and perceived that the leading Lutherans were intent upon reconciliation with the enemy, that he threw himself into the scale and measurably resumed the old dictatorship, which many a time had brought inspiration to the hearts of friends, and had sent dismay into the hearts of the foe. Even then, he could and did write to Melanchthon: "I am displeased, because in your letters you wrote that in this matter you follow my authority. I will neither be nor be called your authority." ‡

Perhaps no one has stated the case, as made known by the facts, better than Professor Plitt. He says: "It would be a mistake to suppose that Luther from Coburg directed affairs on the Evangelical side, at Augsburg. From his fortress, he followed all the proceedings there with the closest attention. He had them continually before him. He lived through them, and fought through them inwardly, and especially did he carry them in his believing, praying heart. As a matter of fact, he exerted a great influence on the course of events. But he did not purposely and intentionally do so. On the contrary, so far as was in him, he purposely refrained from such influencing, and repeatedly expressed himself to the contrary, when something

* De Wette, IV., 53, 49, 62, 63, 65, 82, 83, 84, 88, 89, 91 *et passim.*
† C. R. II., 144.
‡ De Wette, IV., 53.

of the kind was expected of him at Augsburg. *The cause is not mine,* he said. Only at the beginning of his sojourn at Coburg, in his *Admonition to the Clergy Assembled at Augsburg,** did he undertake, in his own strong and free way, to warn them for *their own sakes,* not to aim the bow too high, inasmuch as Münzer's spirit is not yet dead, but finally to propose peace, as he summoned them to make the Gospel free. And then, when his friends at Augsburg showed signs of weakening, and the essential thing seemed to be in peril, even with greater vehemence did he cast his sword into the scale. In other matters, he quietly held himself aloof, and let things come to him, in order to express himself about them occasionally as it seemed good to him." †

The above must be regarded as an intelligent, fair and impartial statement of the facts touching the question of Luther's influence on the Diet at Augsburg. It will be observed that the learned author does not even mention the Augsburg Confession as coming within the scope of that influence. He also declares that it is a mistake to suppose that Luther directed affairs at Augsburg. Had he known *The Oldest Redaction of the Augsburg Confession,* and had he been able to comprehend the crude form of the draft sent to Luther, May 11th, and had he had before him the conclusions of the learned in regard to the Torgau Articles, he doubtless would have said that Luther's influence on the *composition* of the Augsburg Confession was so small that it could not be estimated.

If now the question should be asked, Why did Luther take so little interest in the *composition* of the Confession and in affairs generally at Augsburg, prior to June 25th, the following reasons may be given: 1. Only once was he *officially* consulted about the Confession, May 11th. 2. He was very much occupied with the translation of the Prophets, and of Æsop, and with other literary work. Of his literary labors, he makes frequent mention in his correspondence.‡ 3. He did not expect that anything of importance would be accomplished at or by the Diet.§

* This *Admonition* was addressed to the *Catholic,* not to the Lutheran, clergy at Augsburg. Erl. Ed. of Luther's Works, 24: 356. It has been called Luther's *Augsburg Confession.* It was known at Augsburg by June 7th. Its sale at Augsburg was forbidden by command of the Emperor. C. R. II., 91.

†*Dr. Martin Luther's Leben,* pp. 363-4.

‡ De Wette, IV., 10, 15, 43, 44, 45.

§ C. R. II., 141.

2. *After the Reading of the Confession.*

On Sunday, June 26th, Melanchthon wrote Luther, saying: "Our defense has been presented to the Emperor. In my opinion it is sufficiently vehement." On the following day, June 27th, he wrote to Veit Dietrich, who was with Luther at Coburg, and said: "We have sent you a copy of the Confession. Keep it by you, so that it be not published. But write me back the Doctor's opinion of it." * June 3d, he wrote again to Dietrich, and said: "I desire to know whether the Dr. is in a better humor, and what he thinks about the Apology." †

These letters make it very evident that Melanchthon was impatient to learn what Luther thought about the *finished* Confession, which was now so vastly different from what it was in that first draft which had been sent May 11th. But not only did he wish to know what Luther thought about the Confession, he wished to know also what Luther might think about additional concessions to the enemy, and about certain important subjects of dispute. Hence, in the letter of June 26th, he wrote, among other things, the following: "I now think we will have to decide before the enemy makes reply, what we will concede to them. The entire deliberation will be *about both species, about* Marriage, about Private Mass. Answer with reference to these things, and especially with reference to Private Mass, which our opponents seem utterly unwilling to surrender."

These extracts furnish the proof that Melanchthon did not regard the Confession as the Protestant *ultimatum,* nor consider that the negotiations with the Catholics were closed. He looked on the Confession rather as the first step in the direction of the attainment of that harmony with the Church of Rome, which had been broken by the Wittenberg movement, and which the Saxons especially were seeking to restore. And the sequel shows that he was altogether correct in his prophecy as to the subject of future controversy, subjects as we have learned that do not so much concern the articles of *doctrine,* but belong chiefly to the matters which the Confession itself had catalogued under "abuses which have been corrected."

This letter, besides throwing a good deal of light on the end for which the Confession was written, shows that Melanchthon had two objects in view in sending a copy of the finished Confession to Luther, and in writing the letter that accompanied it to Coburg. The one was to draw out Luther on the subject

* C. R. II., 147. † C. R. II., 157.

of further concessions to the enemy. The other object was to get his opinion in regard to the abuses named. The letter and the copy of the Confession reached Coburg June 29th. Luther replied immediately: "I have received your Apology, and I wonder what you mean by asking what and how much must be conceded to the Papists. As touching the Prince it is a different question, as to what he is to concede, if danger threatens him. So far as I am concerned, more than enough has been already conceded in that Apology. If they refuse that, I do not see what more I can concede, unless their reasons and writings should appear clearer to me than I have hitherto seen them. I am occupied day and night on this matter, thinking, revolving, discussing, searching the Scriptures. Confidence in our doctrine grows upon me. I am more and more confirmed, so that, God willing, I will allow nothing more to be taken from me, come what may." *

It is only now that Melanchthon begins in earnest to seek counsel and assistance from Luther. In this same letter of June 26th, he writes also: "In these momentous concerns we follow your authority." To this Luther makes reply as follows: "I am displeased that in your letter you write that in this matter you follow my authority. I am unwilling to be, or to be called, your authority in this matter. Even though the word might be properly interpreted, nevertheless I do not desire it. If the matter be not at the same time equally yours, I am unwilling that it should be called mine, and should be imposed on you. If it were solely mine, I myself would act."

This letter of Luther's, the salient points of which we have given, is clear and decisive. It shows that on this day he is taking very little responsibility for the movement of affairs at Augsburg, and that his relation towards the Confession is one of criticism, rather than one of approbation.

1. What Melanchthon regards as "sufficiently vehement," Luther regards as too conciliatory—as having conceded too much to the enemy. Hence, his opinion of the Confession, as expressed in this letter, is not *unqualifiedly* approbatory. There can be no doubt that it would have pleased him better, had it been more decidedly anti-Romish, and there can be no doubt that had Luther been at Augsburg, and had been allowed to take part in the composition of the Confession, the same would have been less conciliatory, that is, more *Lutheran* and more positively

* De Wette, IV., 51 *et seqq.*

aggressive against Rome than it is. To verify this conclusion, one has only to read Luther's writings, both the controversial and the didactic, his letter yet to be quoted, and the complaints of the Romanists that the Confession, as it had been given to them, did not fairly and fully represent the Lutheran teaching.*

2. The letter shows that Luther is fixed in his determination to allow nothing additional to be wrested from him. The Elector may do, under the circumstances, what he pleases. But Luther has resolved to make no more concessions. In the common cause *too many* concessions have been already made. The conviction grows upon him that his teaching is scriptural.

3. He is not willing that the men at Augsburg shall shift the responsibility from themselves and place it upon him. It is a common cause in which they are engaged. The men at Augsburg are not to take refuge under his authority. They must meet the foe in their own name.

From the position so emphatically taken in this letter, Luther made no recession. In his subsequent letters written during the Diet, in his references to the Confession and in his references to the negotiations going on there, we find no deviation from the sentiments expressed in this letter. He remains as consistent as truth, and as firm as adamant. Some of his references to the Confession are decidedly *qualified,* and his protests against the spirit of compromise existing at Augsburg, and against the concessions made there, are clear and unequivocal, so that we may say, truthfully, that with this letter of June 29th begins Luther's real influence in determining matters on the Protestant side at Augsburg, that is, it may be truthfully said, that from this time on Luther directs his party at Augsburg, and helps to shape the conclusions that are *finally* reached, so that Professor Maurenbrecker, in treating of the portion of the Diet's history now under review, and of Luther's letters of August 26th, is fully justified in saying: "Luther's letters nerved and strengthened the resolution of the Protestant Princes, and helped to bring back to the theological spokesman (Melanchthon) the Protestant consciousness, that in him had vacillated and hesitated. But for Luther's heroic interposition, who knows that the proceedings at Augsburg would not have had a very lamentable ending!" †

* See Ficker, *Die Erste Konfutation,* p. 40; Cochlaeus, *Vermahnung,* E., II.

† *Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation,* p. 305.

July 3d Luther wrote again to Melanchthon, saying: "Yesterday I carefully re-read your entire Apology. It pleases me very much. But it errs and sins in one thing which operates against Holy Scripture, where Christ says in regard to himself: *We will not have this man rule over us,* and it strikes against that condemnation: *The stone which the builders rejected.* Where there is so much darkness and blindness, what can you expect, but to be rejected? They do not concede to us the name of builders. This they claim for themselves, and justly. We ought to glory in the name of destroyers, scatterers, dissipators, since we are classed with the wicked, and that Stone itself is classed with robbers and is condemned. Hence we have no hope of salvation except in the Lord alone. Let him do wonders. He cannot desert this Stone, because *he is made the head of the corner.*" *

Some persons would see only irony in this extract, except in the second sentence. But a person who does not have a theory to defend, will see in the second sentence. "It pleases very much," a strong expression of approbation couched in general terms, and in what follows a particular criticism, and then irony. The interpretation given to this extract by Calinich, and approved by Knaake, both capable and honest scholars, cannot be successfully impugned: "It is evident that here he (Luther) repeats the stricture, previously indicated, viz., that Melanchthon had not included the article 'of the Pope as Antichrist.'" †

This interpretation is fully sustained by what Luther wrote to Justus Jonas, July 21st: "I now understand the meaning of those demands for more articles. Satan, forsooth, still lives, and he knows very well that your Apology *Leisetreterin* conceals the articles about purgatory, about the worship of saints, and especially about the Pope as Antichrist. Miserable Emperor, if he called this Diet for the purpose of hearing Luther's replies, as though they did not have enough to answer in the present Apology." ‡

* De Wette, IV., 67.

† Calinich, *Luther und die Augsb. Confession,* p. 57. Knaake, *Luther's Antheil,* p. 78.

‡ De Wette, IV., 110. The Latin is: Apologiam vestram Leisetreterin dissimulasse articulos de purgatorio, de sanctorum cultu, et maxime de Antichristo Papa. Flügel defines *Leisetreter,* the masculine, as, "sneaking fellow, spy, eaves-dropper." Grieb: "Spy, eaves-dropper, a sneak, sneaking fellow." Grimm's Wörterbuch: Der vorsichtig auftritt, gewendet auf einen menschen, der um seines vorteils willen nirgens anzustoszen strebt. Luther associates the Leisetreter with the insolent spirits and hypocritical priests (Heuchel-Pfaffen) Grimm, *sub voce.*

There can be no question that Luther here finds fault with the omission of three important articles, which had been the subjects of his fiercest polemic against Rome; and there is no mistaking the meaning of the word *Leisetreterin* in this connection, as applied to the Confession as a whole. He applies it as an opprobrious epithet. The connection in which it is used makes this too plain to admit of question, and then come in the standard dictionaries and Luther's use of the word in other connections bringing irrefutable corroboration. Not only did the Confession move too wearily, in Luther's estimation, but it omitted three important articles. He would have had the Confession move as an open and aggressive force, and include articles against the assumptions of the Pope, against the doctrine of Purgatory and against what he regarded as idolatry in the Roman Catholic Church. But at the same time, Luther recognizes the fact that the Confession contains more—and this was, and especially in its revised and published form, is its glory—than the Papists could answer. And as to the determination to resist further concessions, that is evidenced by the letter which he wrote to Melanchthon July 13th: "For my part I will not yield a hair, nor suffer it to be yielded. Rather will I await every calamity, since they are proceeding so obstinately."* He declares that Christ and Beliel cannot be reconciled, since the chief contention is about *doctrines*. "The Pope is opposed to reconciliation, and Luther begs to be excused."† Indeed Luther's letters of July and August show, with absolute conclusiveness, that he regarded reconciliation as impossible and as undesirable. And he constantly insisted that his friends at Augsburg should make no additional concessions. But his instructions were not heeded as they should have been, and as a consequence the historian has to record at this point one of the most humiliating chapters connected with the entire history of Lutheranism, namely, that of the so-called compromise efforts between the Lutherans and the Catholics during the month of August, A. D. 1530.

3. *Other Opinions.*

But there are other opinions of Luther in regard to the Augsburg Confession, every one of which, in so far as we have been able to discover them, will be exhibited.

July 6th Luther wrote to Conrad Cordatus as follows: "By

* De Wette, IV., 88. † See De Wette, IV., 85, 88, 114.

order of the Emperor it (the Confession) was produced and read before the whole Empire, that is, before the Princes and Estates of the Empire. I am exceeding glad that I have lived to this hour in which Christ has been preached publicly by his illustrious confessors in such a large assembly in such a very beautiful confession." *

On the same day he wrote to Nicholas Hausmann: "Jonas has written me that our Confession (which our Philip prepared) was publicly read by Dr. Christian, chancellor of our Prince, before the Emperor and the Princes and Bishops of the whole Empire." † On the same day Luther published an open letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Mayence, of whom he had just written to Hausmann: "The Archbishop of Mayence is said to be very eager for peace." This letter to the Archbishop is hard to characterize. Judged by our democratic standards, it sounds sycophantic. But we dare not apply our standards of etiquette to the conditions of the sixteenth century. The letter allots to Albert all the grand titles of his birth and offices, as "Most Reverend Father in God, Cardinal Priest of St. Chrysogenus, Primate of Germany, Administrator in Halberstadt, Margrave in Brandenburg, etc., My Most Gracious Lord," and addresses him as "Most Reverend, Most Illustrious, High-born Prince, Most Gracious Lord." But the letter exhibits Luther's wonted bitterness against the Pope and his determination to stand fast in his teaching, because it is the teaching of God's Word.

After briefly reciting the reasons why the letter is to be sent, not in manuscript, but in printed form, published, the writer proceeds as follows: "I humbly pray Your Electoral Princely Grace graciously to receive this my letter. Since Your Electoral Princely Grace is the chief and highest Prelate in Germany, and can do more than anyone else, I have risen above my scruples, and address Your Electoral Princely Grace most humbly in this letter, in order that I may do my full part, and acquit my conscience before God and the world; and should misfortune and God's wrath follow (as I dreadfully fear), that I may be without blame, as one who has sought in every way to promote, and has offered peace.

"Doubtless you and all the others heard the Confession presented by ours. I have the comforting assurance that it has been so composed that it may joyfully say with Christ, its Lord.

* De Wette, IV., 71. † De Wette, IV., 69; Enders, 8: 81.

(John 18: 23): 'If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil, but if well, why smitest thou me?' It shuns not the light, but can say with the Psalmist: 'I will speak of thy testimonies before kings, and shall not be ashamed.' Whosoever doeth the truth comes to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought of God.

"On the contrary I can easily conceive that our enemies will not accept this doctrine. Much less will they be able to refute it. I have no hope that we will be united in doctrine. They have become so embittered and enraged, that they would go into hell—which stands open for them—rather than yield to us, and forsake their own wisdom. We must let them go. We are innocent of their blood. I write to you because I know that our opponents cannot refute our doctrine. By the Confession we clearly show that we have not taught erroneously and falsely." *

On the ground that the doctrine contained in the Confession and held by the Lutherans is true and Scriptural, Luther pleads with the Archbishop to exert himself to the end that the Lutherans be not further persecuted, but be *let alone*. He does not seek doctrinal nor practical union with the Catholics—for of this he sees no hope—but *peace* in separation. He points to the Confession as evidence that the Lutheran doctrine is not heretical.

July 9th Luther wrote the Elector of Saxony as follows: "The enemy thought they had accomplished something when, by command of the Emperor, they had the preaching suppressed. But the miserable people did not perceive that by the written Confession, which was delivered, there was more preaching than ten preachers could probably have done. Isn't it a fine piece of wisdom and a good joke that when Master Eisleben and ours were silenced, the Elector of Saxony rose up with the Confession and preached under the very noses of the Emperor and of the whole Empire, so that they had to hear, and could not reply? . . . Christ was not silenced in that Diet, and in their madness they had to hear from the Confession more than they could have heard in a year from the preachers." †

July 9th Luther wrote thus to Justus Jonas: "The first and greatest thing is that Christ was proclaimed by a public and glorious confession, and set forth openly in their presence, so that they cannot boast that we fled, or were frightened, or

* De Wette, IV., 72 *et seqq.*
† De Wette, IV., 82.

concealed our faith. It grieves me that I am not present at this beautiful confession." *

July 20th he wrote to Melanchthon: "I am deeply grieved that I cannot be with you personally in this most beautiful and most holy confession." †

An examination of these letters in the original makes it evident, at once, that by "public and glorious confession," "beautiful confession," "most beautiful and most holy confession," Luther refers not to the written Confession, but to the heroic act of confessing Christ in the midst of those whom Luther regarded as the enemies of Christ. And in support of this interpretation we refer to the editors of Luther's Letters, both De Wette and Enders, who have the word written thus: confession, that is, they begin the word with a small, and not with a capital, letter. Yet that Luther regarded the written Confession with high favor, that he joyfully confessed that it contained the teaching of the Scriptures, that he is said in later years to have called it *his* Confession ‡—all this is abundantly evident. But that he regarded the Confession as *too* mild, as having *conceded too much* to the enemy, as lacking at least three important articles, and that he called it *Apologia Leisetreterin*—and he is not known to have revoked any of these strictures—all this is documentarily certain. But it is a misfortune, as it is also a fact, that many of the older, and even some modern, historians fixed their eyes too exclusively on Luther's letter of May 15th to the Elector—"I have read over Master Philip's Apology. It pleases me very well" §—without knowing or caring to know that that letter had reference to the first crude draft of the Confession, yet far from being finished, and have quoted from Luther's letter to the Elector of July 9th,|| and have overlooked, or have glozed, the "plus satis cessum in ista Apologia," ¶ and the Scilicet Satan adhuc vivit et bene sensit apologiam vestram *Leisetreterin* dissimulasse articulos de purga-

* DeWette, IV., 85.

† De Wette, IV., 103.

‡ This is reported in Luther's table-talk, and consequently has no authoritative value. It did not come from Luther's pen. Very properly has Kolde said: "And he (Luther) could once say—in a wholly casual way—Catechismus, tabellae, Confessio mea, which can be regarded only as a strong agreement with the substance of the Confession." He also says that this speech has been unduly emphasized, and that "Luther's direct participation in the composition of the Confession was very small." *Einleitung in die Symbolischen Bücher*, pp. xx., xxi.

§ De Wette, IV., 17.

|| De Wette, IV., 82.

¶ De Wette, IV., 52.

torio, de Sanctorum cultu et maxime de Antichristo Papa."* The full purview, which can be obtained only when we have before us all that Luther wrote in regard to the Confession, shows indisputably that Luther's approbation of the Confession was *not unqualified.* His approbation is expressed in general terms, but in several instances it is accompanied by strictures more or less severe. Hence, the evidence is conclusive that he did not regard it as a law for the conscience, and that he did not think that it had spoken the last word on any article of the Christian faith, and that he did not think of binding himself to the letter or to the form of the Confession. Otherwise he would not have accepted Melanchthon's printed editions of the Confession—all of them *Variatae*—and would not have counselled the revision of 1540, and would not have approved it and called it "the dear Confession."† Luther found in the Confession, in all of its editions, the substance of his faith. He knew that it was evangelical and anti-papistical. Hence, he could call it "our Confession which our Philip hath prepared," and could join his brethren at Schmalkald in 1537 in employing Melanchthon's German *Variata* of 1533.‡

Thus have we exhibited all the known facts touching Luther's relation to the Augsburg Confession. It is surprising to learn how little he had to do with it during its composition. His letter of May 15th to the Elector is very brief. It does not express any great interest in the Confession, nor any surprise that Melanchthon has changed the Apology into a Confession, nor does he write to Melanchthon a single word about the Confession, nor answer his letter of May 22d, though Melanchthon in that letter had requested a judgment on the Confession. And when he writes to Lazarus Spengler that he has the affair well in hand, and that a new conflict has been begun, it is now August 28th, or more than two months after the Confession has passed into history. Luther had far more to do with affairs at Augsburg after the delivery of the Confession, than he had before that great transaction. And it was not until September 15th that he wrote to Melanchthon: "You have confessed Christ, you have offered peace, you have obeyed the Emperor, you have borne injuries, you have been drenched with reproaches, you have not rendered evil for evil, in a word, you

* De Wette, IV., 109, 110.
† See *The Lutheran Quarterly* for October, 1898, pp. 569 *et seqq.*
‡ See *The Lutheran Quarterly* for October, 1907, p. 493.

have worthily done the holy work of God, as becometh saints. Rejoice in the Lord and be glad, ye righteous; long enough have ye been sad in the world. Look up and lift up your heads. Your redemption draweth nigh. I will canonize you as faithful members of Christ, and what greater glory do ye seek? Is it a small thing to have rendered a faithful service to Christ? to have conducted yourself as a member worthy of Him? Far be it from you that the favor of Christ should seem so small to you." *

Luther was not inappreciative of the great work that had been done at Augsburg. But had he written the Augsburg Confession, he would have made it stronger and sharper in its protest against Rome. He would have put into it something of the fire and energy that appear in every line of the Schmalkald Articles. He then already knew that reconciliation with Rome was impossible, and that the hour for conciliation had past. But as it is, the Augsburg Confession is *Lutheran* and not un-Lutheran, and both in form and in content it deserves to be known, and will be always known as the Fundamental Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. He who subscribes it as his own confession of faith, by such act of subscription defines and identifies himself as a Lutheran. He may subscribe it according to the letter, or with reference to the system of teaching that it exhibits. The result is essentially the same. In either case the subscriber has his center in the doctrine of justification by faith alone. On the one hand he differentiates himself from the Roman Catholic, who has his center in the Church, with its priesthood culminating in the Pope. On the other hand he differentiates himself from the Calvinist, who has his center in the absolute decree of God, according to which some are elected to eternal life and all others are reprobated to eternal death. It is the center, or the central principle, that determines the system, and regulates the life and the Christian experience of all who intelligently, and from the heart, embrace the system. And the Lutheran interpretation of the Augsburg Confession must be learned from the Christian life and from the theology of the Lutheran Church, from the consensus of Lutheran teaching for almost four hundred years, and not from an accidental explanation made at any particular time, or by any individual, or by any company of individuals.

* De Wette, IV., 165.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE MELANCHTHON EDITIONS OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

In Chapter VI. we learned that both copies of the Confession were delivered to the Emperor immediately after the German copy had been read, that the Emperor handed the German copy to the Elector of Mayence to be deposited in the Imperial Archives, which were kept in that city, and that he kept the Latin copy by him. It is regarded as documentarily * certain, that in the year 1540 the Mayence Original was sent to Dr. John Eck, who wished to compare it with the edition of the Confession issued by Melanchthon in that same year. It is regarded as highly probable that Eck did not return it, and that its loss dates from that time, for, according to the researches of Weber, when in 1545 it was sought at Mayence in order to be sent to the Council of Trent, it was not found.†

The Latin Original, in Melanchthon's own hand-writing, eventually found its way into the Imperial Archives at Brussels, for in the year 1562 it was seen there by William Lindanus, Bishop of Roermund, and by him and Joachim Hopper it was compared with the edition of 1531. In 1569 it was still in Brussels under the care of Viglius Zeichem, a member of the civil council. February 18, 1569, Philip II. of Spain ordered Duke Alva to obtain "the book of the Confession," "in order that they (the damned) might not hold it as a Koran," and to bring it with him to Spain when he returned thither, "and to be careful that the Original be given him, and not a copy, and that no other, not even a trace of it, be left, so that so pernicious a book may be forever destroyed." That the Confession was given to Alva is shown by a letter from Viglius Zeichem to Joachim Hopper.‡ Hence, there can be no doubt that when

* See von Ranke, 3: 176, *note; The Lutheran Quarterly,* Oct., 1898, p. 565; Kolde, *Neue Augustanastudien* (Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1906), p. 139; *Einleitung,* XXX.

† *Kritische Geschichte,* II. Bd., *Vorrede.*

‡ Illustrissimus Dux a me hisce diebus nomine Regis petit, Originalem Confessionem Augustanam Anno CICICXXX Cæsari oblatam, quae meae custodiae ac Archivo tradita erat, dignaque omnino est, ut seruetur, quo haeretici, qui postea multa ei asperserunt, malitiae suae convincantur. Given by Kolde, *Neue Augustanastudien, ut supra,* p. 744. Weber, *Geschichte,*

Alva returned to Spain, in 1573, he took the hated document with him, and that it was destroyed as a sacrifice to the fanaticism of Philip.*

But whatever may be the minutiae touching the history of the two Originals of the Augburg Confession, it is certain that the most thorough searches in the Imperial Archives at Mayence, in the Imperial Archives at Brussels, in the Vatican Library at Rome, and in several archival libraries in Spain, have failed to bring either of them to light.† They are not known to *exist anywhere in the world*, and are believed to have been destroyed. Neither did the Protestants make an *official* and *certified* copy of the Confession as it was read and delivered. Hence there is no such document in use, nor even known to exist, as the *original and unaltered* Augsburg Confession, a distinction that should be applied only to the Confession in that form in which it was read and delivered, though the words are scarcely applicable in view of the fact that the Confession was revised and changed up till the last hour before its delivery. But the words *original and unaltered* may be allowed in an official and diplomatic sense, provided they be applied (as they were intended to be applied when employed by the authors of the Formula of Concord in this relation) to the Confession in the form in which it was officially read and delivered. Any other use of the words in this relation, or the application of them to any *printed edition* of the Confession, is a *falsification of fact and of history,* since every known printed edition of the Augsburg Confession is known to be, and can be shown to be, MATERIALLY different from the Augsburg Confession as it was officially read and delivered, June 25, 1530; if we except *Die unveränderte Augsburgische Konfession deutsch und lateinisch nach den besten Handschriften aus dem Besitze der Unterzeichner. Kritische Ausgabe* (1901), constructed by Professor Tschackert, and accepted by all Augsburg Confession scholars as reproducing "the original and unaltered Augsburg Confession" with a high degree of accuracy, and consequently as discrediting utterly the *Textus Receptus,* German and Latin, of the Book of Concord, and all the Melanchthon, and all other printed editions; though this *Critical Edition* of Tschackert has received no ecclesiastical authorization or sanction, and has not been made the symbol of any ecclesias-

I., 77. See also *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* XXIX. Band, I. Heft, pp. 81 *et seqq.*

* See Kolde, *Neue Augustanastudien, ut supra.* pp. 743 *et seqq.*

† *Kirchenlexikon,* I., 1645.

tical body. But it has great historical and critical value, as it shows, if not verbally and literally, yet certainly, to a high degree of accuracy, the Augsburg Confession as it was read and delivered, June 25, 1530; and it enables us to settle forever, in its essential aspects, the hitherto hazy and uncertain contention over the *Confessio Invariata.* It shows, further, that no edition of the Augsburg Confession in official use in the Lutheran Church to-day can be claimed by its subscribers as "*that first and unaltered Augsburg Confession,*" not even in a *technical* sense as over against the Latin *Variata* of 1540, since the designation, "*that first and unaltered Augsburg Confession*" was coined to stand for and to represent the Augsburg Confession as it was read and delivered at Augsburg, June 25, 1530—a form of the Augsburg Confession which is not known to have been seen by Protestant eyes since it was officially read and delivered, and is not known to exist anywhere in the world, except, to repeat, in so far as it has been restored by Professor Tschackert from what has been called "authentic codices." From which it must follow, of course, that there is no such document in ecclesiastical use to-day, and never has been, as "*that first and unaltered Augsburg Confession,*" for if the document intended by that designation is not known to exist and has not been seen by Protestant eyes since it was read and delivered, it could not have been, and cannot now be, in ecclesiastical use. Hence it is not only invidious, but it is untrue, as a matter of fact, when any ecclesiastical body says: "We accept the Unaltered Augsburg Confession," etc.* We find the phrase *unveränderte Augsburgische Konfes-*

* The word *unaltered* with such meaning is employed in the *Lichtenberg Bedenken,* Feb. 16, 1576, where it appears thus: *Augspurgische erste ungeenderte Confession.* Hutter, *Concordia Concors,* Wittebergae, 1614, p. 78*b*. In the Compendious Form of Doctrine in (Müller, p. 569) the Formula of Concord, *Solid Declaration,* we have, in the German: *Erste ungeenderte Augspurgische Confession;* in the Latin: *Augustana prima illa et non mutata Confessio.* We have not been able to discover the first use of the word *invariata* in this relation, but it is exactly equivalent to *non mutata* and *ungeenderte;* and that by "*that first and unaltered Augsburg Confession*" the authors of the Formula of Concord and the editors of the Book of Concord meant the Augsburg Confession "precisely in the form in which it was committed to writing in the year 1530, and presented to the Emperor Charles V." (*Formula of Concord,* Jacobs, p. 536), is proved beyond doubt, or even the possibility of doubt, by their own solemn asseverations in the Preface to the Book of Concord and in the Preface to the Form of Concord. See Jacobs's *Book of Concord,* vol. I., pp. 14 and 536; the New Market edition of the *Book of Concord,* pp. 93 and 593; Müller's *Libri Symbolici,* tenth edition, pp. 12 and 569; and Hanne, *Hist. Critica Augs. Conf.,* pp. 18, 19. They even go so far as to say that copies of the Confession, which have been preserved in the archives of their predecessors, they "caused to

sion in the *Instruction* given to the Visitors of Electoral Saxony in 1555. But here the word *unveränderte* has reference to Melanchthon's German edition of the Confession issued officially in 1555 for this Saxon visitation. See below (p. 222). See Johannsen, *Die Anfänge des Symbolzwang*, p. 67.

1. *The Editio Princeps.*

Immediately after the Confession was read the Emperor requested the Lutheran Princes to refrain from publishing it. They promised to comply with his request. But in a very short time six editions in German and one in Latin were published surreptitiously. They are called the Ante-Melanchthon editions. They have no official or diplomatic value, and were so carelessly printed as to seem to have been purposely corrupted. Thereupon Melanchthon undertook the preparation of an edition "revised and emended," using as he tells us, "a copy of good credit," and "adding the Apology which had been also offered to his Imperial Majesty." *

This edition, known as the editio princeps, Latin and German, has different titles, though the *edition is one.*† The Latin title of the largest number of copies that have come down to us is as follows:

CONFESSIO FIDEI
exhibita inuictiſs. Imp. Carolo V.
Caeſari Aug. in Comicijs
Auguſtae,
Anno
M. D. XXX.

Addita eſt Apologia Confeſsionis.

Beide, Deudſch
vnd Latiniſch.

Pſalm. 119.
Et loquebar de teſtimonijs tuis in conſpectu Regum, & non confundebar.

WITEBERGAE.

be compared by men worthy of confidence with the copy which had been presented to the Emperor himself, and is preserved in the archives of the Holy Roman Empire." But they took into their Book of Concord a vicious copy of a German manuscript destitute of authority, and for the Latin, Melanchthon's second edition.

* See *Preface ad Lectores.* There is no Preface *ad Lectores* to the German *editio princeps.*

† C. R. XXVI., pp. 235 *et seqq.*

At the end of the Apology are the words: Impressum per Georgium Rhau, M. D. XXXI.

The title of the German *editio princeps,* reprinted from the original, two copies of which are before us, is as follows:

Confessio odder Bekantnus des Glaubens etlicher Fürsten vnd Stedte: Vberantwort Keiserlicher Maiestat: zu Augspurg.

Anno M. D. XXX.

Apologia der Confessio.

At the end of the Apology, given in the German translation of Justus Jonas, on the opposite page, alone, stands: Gedruckt zu Wittemberg durch Georgen Rhaw. Anno. M. D. XXXI.

This bilingual edition of the Confession and Apology is in quarto form. Weber, on the basis of a confused and uncertain letter written by Pistorius to Landgrave Philip, June 18, 1561, concluded that the Confession, both Latin and German, was printed without the Apology, and privately circulated already in the Autumn of 1530.* Bindseil has followed Weber, and has dated this edition anno 1530-1531.† But Professor Kolde has recently shown, on the basis of data not known to Weber and Bindseil, "that *an edition of the Augustana proceeding from Melanchthon has not existed from the year 1530,* that the *editio princeps* was first published in the Spring (the end of April or the beginning of May) together with the

* *Kritische Geschichte,* II., 11 *et seqq.*

† C. R. XXVI., 234. Bindseil notes a very slight difference—a mere matter of spacing—in the titles of this first German edition. C. R. XXVI., 240.

Apology, yet in such a way, that, inasmuch as the German translation of the Apology by Jonas was not yet finished, the *Latin* text was first published alone, and probably the recollection of this fact, namely, that the work at the beginning came out incomplete, helped to create the report about an earlier edition of the Augsburg Confession.''* Though Kolde holds, as is evident from Melanchthon's Preface, that the Confession began to be printed in the year 1530.

But as regards the date on the title-page, both Latin and German, namely, ANNO M. D. XXX., there can be no question that that marks the date of the Diet at Augsburg, and not the date of the publication of the edition, as is evident from the fact that that date appears on the title page of *all* the Melanchthon, and of very many other, editions of the Confession. And when we consider that in the Preface Melanchthon has said: ''And we have added the Apology which was also offered to his Imperial Majesty,'' we have a clear proof that this edition was not published in the Autumn of 1530, for we know that the Apology was not completed till near the middle of April, 1531.†

This—we repeat it for the sake of emphasis and clearness—is the *editio princeps* (first printed edition) of the Augsburg Confession, Latin and German, with the Apology in Latin added to the former, and with the Apology in Jonas's translation added to the latter. It is the private work of Melanchthon. There is not in the Preface, nor in any other writing that has come down to us, a single word that indicates that Melanchthon was authorized by the Elector or by any other person to publish an edition of the Augsburg Confession, though it is probable that the Elector, and certain that some other persons, knew what was being done.‡ Nor does it seem to have occurred to Melanchthon that the Confession was an official document in such a sense that its *verba ipsissima* dare not be changed.§ He had written it to be a defence and vindication of the Lutherans as ''professing no doctrine contrary to the authority of the Holy Scriptures and of the Catholic Church,'' as he says in the Preface to this edition. That the Catholic theologians had expressed dissatisfaction with por-

* *Neue Kirchliche Zietschrift*, XVII. Jahrgang, Oct., 1906, pp. 729 *et seqq.*

† See Kolde, *ut supra*, pp. 733-4.

‡ See Kolde, *ut supra*, p. 731.

§ Von Ranke, vol. 3, 175, vol. 5, p. 323.

tions of it, and that it had been already printed and circulated in a corrupt form, seemed to furnish a sufficient reason "to publish a revised and emended edition" (Melanchthon's Preface). That he was influenced in places by the Catholic Confutation is clearly evident, as especially in Articles XIII. and XVIII., and that he acted generally with great independence towards the text of the Confession as officially read and delivered, is also evident, though the changes and emendations are in very large part only redactional. But in not a few places the changes are material, and do materially affect the text of the Confession, so that Professor Tschackert is perfectly correct when he says: "Melanchthon's Latin text and that of the Book of Concord are thus with entire certainty not the Confessio invariata delivered June 25th, but *a private work of Melanchthon.*"*

That the differences in texts may appear evident to the eye, we place the most important of them in parallel columns, and henceforth write the word invariata thus: "*Invariata.*"

THE MANUSCRIPT TEXT. "*Invariata.*"	MELANCHTHON'S EDITIO PRINCEPS.
Art. XIII. The Article closes with the word *ostenduntur.*	Melanchthon adds the damnatory anthithesis: Damnant igitur illos qui docent, quod sacramenta ex opere operato iustificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quae credat remitti peccata.
Art. XVIII. The Article closes with the word "homicidium etc."	Melanchthon adds the damnatory anthithesis: Damnant Pelagianos et alios, qui docent, quod sine Spiritu Sancto, solis naturae viribus possimus Deum super omnia diligere, item praecepta Dei facere quoad substantiam actuum. Quanquam enim externa opera aliquo modo efficere natura possit-potest enim continere manus a furto, a caede: tamen interiores motus non potest efficere, ut timorem Dei, fiduciam erga Deum, castitatem, patientiam etc.
Art. XXI. in Epilogue: Tota dissensio est de paucis quibusdam abusibus.	Sed dissensio est de quibusdam abusibus.
Art. XXIV. Ad hoc praecipue opus est ceremoniis, ut doceant imperitos.	Ad hoc unum opus est ceremoniis, ut doceant imperitos.

* *Die Unveraenderte A. C.*, p. 61.

Art. XXVI. Here: The words "die festo" are followed immediately by "Act. XV."	Here between "die festo" and "Act. XV." we find the following: Item: Si mortui estis cum Christo ab elementis mundi, Quare tamquam viventes in mundo decreta facitis: ne attingas, ne gustes, ne consed afflictiva sint opera etc.
Art. XXVI. Here: Aut satisfacere pro peccatis.	Here: Aut iustificari.
Art. XXVI. Here: Christianismus.	Here: Christiana iustitia.
Art. XXVIII. Here: Quod ieiunia sint opera etc.	Here: Quod ieiunia non naturae, trectes?
Art. XXVIII. Here: Ecclesiis imperare.	Here: Ecclesias cogere.

After making this exhibit Professor Tschackert says: "*As in all these* places, so in *numerous other cases all the authoritative codices are unanimous against Melanchthon.* Hence it is certain that the Latin text printed by Melanchthon in the Autumn of 1530,* and taken into the Book of Concord in 1580, or in 1584,† is not the text of the Confessio invariata." P. 62.

If one compares the *editio princeps* with Professor Tschackert's *Critical Edition,* he cannot resist the conclusion that he has here an *altered* Augsburg Confession. The attitude toward the *dogmatic* tradition of the Roman Catholic Church *is significantly altered.* Especially is this true in the condemnation of the *opus operatum* in Article XIII., and in regard to "the substance of actions" in Article XVIII. But to our mind the most significant change is found in the Epilogue to Article XXI. Here the "*Invariata*" has: "Tota dissensio est de paucis quibusdam abusibus." Now if the Reformation, prior to 1530, was only a dispute about a few abuses, then we have utterly misinterpreted its history and have misread its literature. We have always been of the opinion that the Reformation in its initial movement at Wittenberg, the posting of *The Ninety-five Theses,* was in essence a *doctrinal* revolt, and we have always held that the *Assertion of all the Articles, The Three Great Reformation Writings,* the *Formula Missae,* the *Deutsche Messe,* the Catechisms, *The Visitation Articles,* the *Loci Communes,* were mainly *doctrinal* treatises, written in antithesis to much of the doctrinal teaching that prevailed in the Roman

* Tschackert should have written: In the Spring of 1531. See above from Kolde.

† The edition of 1584 contains the *authentic* Latin text, *ibid.* 60.

Catholic Church at that time. We have always taken offense at what we read in the Epilogue to Article XXI. of the *editio princeps:* "Sed dissensio est de quibusdam abusibus." There was *dissension in regard to certain abuses,* but we must change our mind radically in regard to the Reformation before we can reach the conclusion that *the entire dissension had reference to some few abuses.* But so says the *"Confessio Invariata."*

Turning now from the Latin to the German *editio princeps,* we find that this differs from the *"Invariata"* in about four hundred and fifty places, though, as in the Latin, the vast majority of the differences are purely redactional. But some do materially affect the sense. Article IV. in the *editio princeps* has been entirely rewritten, and has been amplified from eighty-six words in the *"Invariata"* to one hundred and forty-one words. In literal translation Article IV. of the *editio princeps* is as follows:

"And since men have been born in sin, and do not keep the law of God, and cannot love God from the heart, it is taught that we cannot merit forgiveness of sin by our work or satisfaction. Also we are not esteemed righteous before God on account of our work, but we obtain forgiveness of sins and are accounted righteous before God for the sake of Christ out of grace, through faith, so that we receive sure consolation in the promise of Christ and believe that forgiveness of sin is surely given us, and that God will be gracious unto us, will esteem us righteous, and will give eternal life for the sake of Christ, who, by his death, hath reconciled God, and hath made satisfaction for sin. He who thus truly believes, obtains forgiveness of sin, becomes acceptable to God, and is esteemed righteous before God, for the sake of Christ, Rom. III. and IV."

Article XIII. in the *"Invariata"* ends with und den glauben dadurch sterket. In the *editio princeps* the damnatory clause is added, as in the Latin. In Article XVIII. also the damnatory clause is added. Important changes are made in Articles XXVII. and XXVIII.

Thus Melanchthon's German *editio princeps* is very much *varied.*

2. *Editio Octavae Formae 1531.*

As early as June, perhaps even earlier, Melanchthon began to prepare a new Latin edition of the Confession and Apology. The former he conformed more closely to the German *editio princeps* on which he seems to have bestowed more care than

on the Latin *editio princeps.** His main object seems to have been to make the article on justification in the Apology more luminous.† But he did not make any change in Article IV. of the Confession. A very important addition is made to Article XII. in the antithesis:

EDITIO PRINCEPS.	EDITIO OCTAVAE FORMAE.
Rejiciuntur et isti, qui non docent remissionem peccatorum per fidem contingere, sed jubent nos mereri gratiam per satisfactiones nostras.	Rejiciuntur et isti, qui non docent remissionem peccatorum per fidem contingere, sed docent remissionem peccatorum contingere propter nostram dilectionem et opera. Rejiciuntur et isti qui Canonicas satisfactiones docent necessarias esse ad redimendas poenas aeternas, aut poenas purgatorii.

In Article XXI., in addition to a couple minor changes, the following declaration is made against the adversaries: Nec docent quod sola fide propter Christum accipiamus remissionem peccatorum, which marks the first introduction of the *sola fide* into the doctrinal teaching of the Augsburg Confession, except as it appears in a quotation in Article VI.

This octavo edition very generally supplanted the *editio* edition of Luther's Works (Vol. IV., pp. 191 *et seqq.*) in 1570, *princeps*. It was received as the "first edition" into the Jena an edition published under the auspices of the Weimar-Jena theologians for the special purpose of reproducing Luther's Works in the most accurate form as over against the Wittenberg edition. At the Naumburg Diet in 1561, this octavo edition of the Confession was signed and sealed by the Lutheran Princes there assembled "as the original." In 1569 it was taken into the *Corpus Julium* edited by Chemnitz and often republished.‡ In 1571 it was taken into the *Corpus Doctrinae Thuringicum*, which was published by the Jena theologians as a set-off to the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum*, and in 1580 it was admitted into the first Latin edition of the Book of Concord.

* Weber, II., pp. 68-91; Hase, *Libri Symbolici*, p. XI.; Francke, *Libri Symbolici*, p. XXVII., note 10.

† C. R. II., p. 506. In the Preface he changed only the words *ante duos menses* to *ante semestre*. The Preface to the *editio princeps* begins thus: Haec confessio prorsus ignorantibus principibus qui eam Cæsari exhibuerunt ab avido aliquo typographo, acte duos menses publica est.

‡ See Preface to the *Corpus Julium*, dated 1576, on fol. 4. That this *Corpus* "was published in print in the year 1569" is certain. See Rehtmeyer, *Braunschweig-Kirchen-Historie*, III., 349. See also pages 425, 429. Schlegel, *Kirchen-und Reformationsgeschichte*, II., pp. 272 *et seqq.* Hase, p. XII., note 6. Francke, p. XXVII., note 10. Walch, *Introductio*, p. 84.

which "was published in the name of the Princes and the Estates," and it was appealed to by the authors of the Formula of Concord as "*that first and unaltered Augsburg Confession* delivered to the Emperor Charles V. at Augsburg in the year 1530, at the Great Diet."—"A proof of how little the theologians of that time knew of Melanchthon's editions, and of how little they were able to distinguish them from each other," says Weber.*

3. *The German Variatae.*

1. Melanchthon was as little satisfied with the German *editio princeps* as he was with the Latin. Weber thinks that he began already in 1531 to prepare a new German edition of the Confession, shortly after he had published the octavo Latin edition.† However this may be, it is certain that a new German edition was finished in 1532, and was published at the end of that year, for at the very beginning of January, 1533, Melanchthon sent a book to Spalatin, and wrote: "I have also added the revised German Apology. I have revised two entire articles, namely, that on original sin, and that on righteousness."‡ that is, on justification. The title of this edition is verbally and literally identical with that of the *editio princeps,* except that after the word *Maiestat* we have: Auff dem Reichstag gehalten/ zu Augspurg/ Anno M. D. XXX. Apologia der Confessio/ mit vleis emendirt. The place and the date of publication do not appear on the chief title-page of the Confession. But on the special title-page that precedes the Apology in German we read: Witeberg. M. D. XXXIII. Then at the end of the Apology: Gedruckt zu Wittemberg durch Georgen Rhaw. This edition is known in the Bibliography of the Confession as the German *variata* of 1533. Sometimes it has been referred to as the first German *variata.*

The author has informed us why he revised the Confession, which is still frequently called Apology. January 1, 1533, he wrote to Camerarius: "The German Apology and the article on righteousness I have treated more sharply."§ A day or so later he wrote to Spalatin: "I send you the Pastor. . . . I have also added the revised German Apology. I have revised (retexui) two entire articles, that on original sin and that on righteousness. I request you to examine them. I hope

* *Kritische Geschichte,* II., 98 *et seqq.*
† *Kritische Geschichte,* II., 55.
‡ C. R. II., 625. See also 619. C. R. XXVI., 698.
§ C. R. II., 624.

they will be profitable to pious consciences. For I have illumined, as it seems to me, most clearly, the subject of righteousness," that is, of justification.*

Turning now to the Articles of Faith in this new German edition of the Confession, we find that in Article II., *Of Original Sin,* at the end of the thesis, instead of "Who are not through baptism and the Holy Spirit born again," we have "Who are not born again by baptism and faith in Christ through the Gospel and the Holy Spirit"; while more than half of the anthithesis is rewritten and materially changed. Change has been also made in Article XIX., *Of the Cause of Sin,* though it is not extensive nor of great importance. But taking all the changes together we find that the articles on sin have been greatly illumined. And as for Article IV. we find that it has been entirely rewritten, and has been enlarged to about six times the size of the corresponding article in the *"Invariata"* and in the *Textus Receptus* of the Book of Concord, and to about four times the size of the Article in the German *editio princeps.*

In this *Variata* the author declares that "this is the chief article of faith, that forgiveness of sins is bestowed without merit on our part, for the sake of Christ." As a statement of justification "alone through faith, without merit," this article is not surpassed in clearness and compactness by any other statement of the doctrine in the entire field of Lutheran theology. Hence, as an article of faith, it is greatly superior to Article IV. in the earlier editions and in the *"Invariata."*

There are also important changes by expansion, elaboration and addition in Articles V., VI., XII., XIII., XV., XX., and it seems as though they had been all made for the purpose of throwing light on and of adding strength and clearness to the doctrine of "righteousness." We thus have a clear perception of Melanchthon's reasons for revising the Confession again in 1532.†

As regards Articles IX., X., XI., there are no changes except in mere matters of orthography. In Article XVIII., instead of: "We cannot keep the high commandments in the heart," we have: "We cannot keep the high commandments in the heart without the Holy Spirit," which adjusts the antithesis more accurately to the thesis: "Without the grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit."

* C. R. II., 625.

† See Kolde, *Einleitung,* p. xxiii.

This first German *Variata* was reprinted at Tübingen in 1535. Bindseil says: "There is no doubt that the theologians assembled at Schmalkald in 1537 employed this edition." * This edition was taken into the Wittenberg edition of Luther's Works (Vol. IX.), and was placed in the *Corpus doctrinae Philippicum* (1560), in the *Corpus Pomeranicum* (1564), and is noted in the *Index* as the "Confession . . . delivered to his Imperial Majesty at the Diet held at Augsburg in the year 1530." In the Schmalkald Articles it is called: "The Articles of the Confession presented to the Emperor at the Diet of Augsburg." †

2. In the year 1540 Melanchthon published a German edition of the Confession in octavo form. The title is literally and verbally identical with the preceding, except that in this we have *oder* instead of *odder* and Anno 1530 instead of Anno M. D. XXX., and at the bottom of the page: *Anno* M. D. XL. Of this edition Bindseil says: "In which month this edition was published cannot be definitely determined, inasmuch as no mention of it is found in Melanchthon's letters.. Since at the Diet of Worms, which was opened Nov. 25, 1540, it was delivered Nov. 30th, to the Catholics (for which reason it is preserved in the Mayence Chancery), it must, of course, have been finished before that Diet." ‡ Weber says: "This edition has one and the same arrangement with that of 1533. Rhau printed it with the same letters even, and they agree almost throughout, line for line and page for page, though on the last sheet, F, the lines have been somewhat changed." § The differences in the two editions, as noted by Weber and exhibited by him in parallel columns, consist of a few printer's errors and of nine readings that are peculiar to the edition of 1540, though these do not in any way change the sense. The fact is, this edition is simply a corrected reprint of the edition of 1533.

3. In this same year (1540) there appeared an edition in quarto form. The title is identical in words with the preceding, except that instead of *Anno* M. D. XL., we read: Ich rede von deinen Zeugnissen fur Königen, Und scheme mich nicht. Wittemberg, 1540. Of this edition Weber says: "After a careful collation with the two preceding editions, I have found that in printing, not the edition of 1533, but the octavo edition of 1540, has been followed. For it repeats not only the

* C. R. XXVI., 699. See Weber, II., 59 *et seqq.* † C. R. III., 286.
‡ C. R. XXVI., 707; Weber, *ut supra*, II., 67. § *Ut supra*, II., 64.

readings that are peculiar to this, and that distinguished it from that of 1533, but even many of its typographical errors.'' *

Weber then places the variations of the three editions in parallel columns. But none of these changes the sense or amplifies the form. He finds that the quarto edition of 1540 is more accurately printed than the octavo edition of the same year.

4. In 1550 appeared an octavo edition at Wittenberg printed by Peter Seitz. The title is identical with the two preceding, except that instead of Bekantnus, we have here Bekantnis, and at the bottom, 1550. This edition is a reprint from the octavo edition of 1540, though it has a few readings that are different from the edition of 1540,† but these do not in any manner change the sense. This edition also has the Apology, as translated by Jonas, appended.

5. In the year 1555 an edition in quarto was printed at Wittenberg by George Rhau's Heirs. The title is as follows:

Confessio oder Bekentnis des Glaubens/ Durch den durchleuchtigsten/ hochgebornen Fürsten und Herrn/ Herrn Johans Hertzogen zu Sachssen/ Chürfürsten &c., und etliche Fürsten und Stedte/ uberantwort Keiserlicher Maiestat/ auff dem Reichstag/ gehalten zu Augspurgk/ Anno 1530.

Und dieser Confession Repetitio/ geschrieben von wegen des Concilij zu Trident Anno 1551.

Und durch den durchleutichtigsten/ hochgebornen Fürsten und Herrn/ Herrn Augustum Hertzogen zu Sachssen, Chürfürsten &c., von wegen der Visitation jtzt wider in druck verordnet/

Anno
1555
WITTEMBERG.

This edition, as is declared on the title-page, was ordered by the Elector of Saxony for use in the visitation of the churches in the year 1555.‡ Weber says that this edition was introduced everywhere in the Electorate.§ It differs in only a few places, and that insignificantly, from the octavo edition of 1540.||

This edition is not accompanied by the Apology.

* *Ut supra,* II., 68.

† See C. R. XXVI., 713.

‡ This edition was held to be *unveränderte,* ''unaltered.'' Johannsen, *Anfänge des Symbolzwang,* p. 67.

§ *Ut supra,* II., 72-75. C. R. XXVI., 714-716.

|| See Weber, *ut supra,* II., 73.

6. In 1556 an edition in octavo form, with the Apology, was published by George Rhau's Heirs. The title is verbally identical with that of 1550, except that after "Wittemberg" we have ¼556. It is a reprint of the octavo edition of 1540, with pages numbered alike and for the most part agreeing line for line.*

7. In 1558 George Rhau's Heirs issued an edition with title verbally identical with that described above under "5," except as to date. Weber says of it: "It is a mere reprint of the Visitation edition of 1555, and agrees with this almost throughout line for line and page for page." †

These seven German *Variatae,* all printed at Wittenberg, are noted and described by Bindseil as Melanchthon editions.‡

The last six are, substantially, reprints of the edition of 1533. In doctrine they do not differ from each other by the breadth of a hair. In form they differ much in orthography (since during the first half of the sixteenth century the orthography of German words was very arbitrary) and occasionally in what are technically called "readings" (Lesarten), such, in general, as we find in the best class of New Testament codices.

To be convinced of this, namely, of the complete agreement in doctrinal teaching, and of the variety of spelling, and of the occasional difference in readings, in these *Variatae,* we have only to consult the text of the quarto edition of 1540, as reprinted by Bindseil with the *variants* of the other *variatae* editions, printed in the margin.§ Hence, if we compare these seven *Variatae,* taken all together as a class, with the *editio princeps,* we find exactly that condition of things which we have described above—not a different doctrine, but the same doctrine elaborated in certain most important articles, clarified and strengthened, rendered more pronouncedly Lutheran, and more decidedly antithetical to the then current teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. Of this no one can be in doubt for a moment who will compare these *Variatae* with the *editio princeps,* to say nothing about the German *Textus Receptus* and the "*Invariata.*" Hence, from the standpoint of doctrinal clearness and of Lutheran distinctiveness, it cannot but be regarded as a great misfortune that these German *Variatae,* doctrinally identical, which for nearly

* See Weber, *ut supra,* II., 74, 75. Also C. R. XXVI., 717-719.
† *Ut supra,* II., 77.
‡ C. R. XXVI., 695-722.
§ C. R. XXVI., 723 *et segq.* Compare 538 *et segq.*

fifty years had supplanted the *editio princeps,* were themselves supplanted by the *Textus Receptus,* which was taken from a manuscript "without authentic value," and which "is through and through inaccurate." *

In the qualities named above it cannot be denied that these German *Variatae* greatly surpass the *editio princeps,* to say nothing about the *Textus Receptus* of the Formula of Concord and the *"Invariata."* And it may be safely opined that had the authors of the Formula of Concord and the Elector August had as much critical acumen, and as much historical knowledge of the *"Invariata"* and of the different Melanchthon editions of the Augsburg Confession as they had desire to conciliate the Flacianists, they would not have made the blunder they did when they wrote the words: *"That first and unaltered Augsburg Confession,"* and then took an unauthentic and thoroughly inaccurate text into the Book of Concord.†

Moreover, these *Variatae* show that in the twenty-six years that intervened between 1532, when he prepared the first German *Variata,* and the year 1558, when he published the second authorized edition (see "7" above), Melanchthon made no changes in the doctrine of the Confession, which is *prima facie* evidence that he was not conscious of any doctrinal change in himself. Nor even when engaged in preparing the edition of 1533 does he indicate or intimate that he wishes to introduce any new views of doctrine. He only wishes to throw more light on the Confession, and to make the article on Justification more accurate, and to make that article and that on Sin "profitable to pious consciences." ‡

4. *The Latin Variata of 1540.*

There is evidence that leads to the conclusion that when in 1535 Melanchthon revised the *Loci,* he was at the same time engaged in revising the Confession in Latin.§ Bindseil is of

* Tschackert, p. 61.

† For reasons not fully known the Elector August of Saxony, in the year 1576, sent to Mayence and requested the Archbishop of Mayence to send him a copy of "the original Augsburg Confession as it had been delivered in German in the year 1530." A copy of the Confession was sent under the seal of the Secretary of the Archbishop. But it was not a copy of "the written original Confession," but a copy of a manuscript which had been made before the Confession had been signed, and which, consequently, has no authentic value. "The officials of the Mayence Archives had deceived the Archbishop of Mayence and the Elector of Saxony." Tschackert, *ut supra,* p. 60, and Weber, *ut supra,* I., pp. 122 *et seqq.;* Göschel, p. 48. A copy of an unauthentic manuscript was put in the Book of Concord.

‡ C. R. XXVI., 698. Weber, II., p. 103.

§ C. R. XXVI., 340-2.

the opinion that the revised Latin Confession was also printed in 1535.* Caspar Peucer, Melanchthon's son-in-law, says that it was written in the year 1538, shortly before the Diets of Worms and Ratisbon, and that it "was ordered, revised and approved by Luther, and that it was necessary that it be written on account of the adversaries, who had found fault with many things that needed to be explained in order that the occasions and the reasons for such cavils might be removed." † Nicholas Selneccer, one of the authors of the Formula of Concord, says: "The later Confession was revised in 1538, and was read over and approved by Luther, as witnesses still living affirm." ‡

The object of the revisions, as stated by Melanchthon himself, was "to throw more light on numerous discussions," and "to make it better in the article on justification," and to bring into clearer distinctness the proposition that "We are justified by faith alone." §

But as no copy of this varied Wittenberg edition, bearing date 1535, or 1538, is known to exist, it may be fairly concluded that it was not published in either of these years.

This varied edition, quarto in form, was published at Wittenberg under the following title:

CONFESSIO
FIDEI EXHIBITA
INVICTISS. IMP. CAROLO
V. Caesari Aug. in Comicijs
AVGVSTAE.
ANNO. M. D. XXX.

Addita est Apologia Confessionis diligenter recognita.

PSALMO. CXIX.
Et loquebar de testimonijs tuis in conspectu Regum, et non confundebar.

VITEBERGAE. 1540.

* C. R. XXVI., 341. See *The Luth. Quarterly*, 1898, 560.
† *Epistola Dedicatoria*, Witt. Edition of Melanchthon's *Opera*.
‡ *Catalogus Brevis*, fol. 97.
§ C. R. XXV., 340-342.

The Confession is followed by the Apology, at the end of which we read: IMPRESSUM VITEBERGAE per Georgium Rhau. M. D. XL. And though it is said in the main title that the Apology "has been carefully revised," yet, as a matter of fact, Melanchthon never carefully revised the Apology after 1531, and the Apology printed with this edition of the Confession is the same as that printed with the octavo edition of 1531,* a very few things excepted.

This Latin edition of the year 1540 is known *via eminentiae* as the *Confessio Augustana Variata.* In *form* it differs greatly from the Latin *editio princeps,* but Melanchthon himself declared officially at the Diet of Worms, January, 1541, that "the meaning of the things is the same, though in the later edition some things have been either more mildly expressed or have been better explained." † Bindseil has well stated the case as follows: "Very many Articles of Faith, especially IV., V., VI., XVIII., XX., XXI., have been more copiously treated. Articles XI., XII., have been transposed, and Article X. has been changed. Also: The first five articles on the Abuses that have been corrected, have been not only changed, but have been arranged in a different order. In the earlier Melanchthon editions they are arranged as follows: I. Of both Species: II. Of the Marriage of Priests; III. Of the Mass; IV. Of Confession; V. Of the Difference of Meats. In this edition of 1540 their order is as follows: I. Of the Mass: II. Of Both Kinds of the Sacrament; III. Of Confession: IV. Of the Distinction of Meats and of like Papal Traditions; V. Of the Marriage of Priests." ‡.

The change in Article X. can be best shown by a parallel exhibition:

"*Invariata,*" EDITIO PRINCEPS and EDITIO OCTAVAE FORMAE of 1531:	VARIATA OF 1540:
De Coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in coena Domini, et improbant secus docentes.	De Coena Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi, vescentibus in Coena Domini.

Here is change in form, indeed, but there is not the *slightest*

* C. R. XXVI., 345. Weber, II., 103-8. Francke says: "Sed pauca tantum secus habent atque in ed. 1531, 8. Quare cum *Hase* non dubitaverim, quin Mel. confessionem intellexit, quum a. 1533. *Ant. Corvino* scripsit: 'Latinam apologiam totam retexam.'" P. xxxvi., note 15.

† C. R. IV., 43, 47. See *The Luth. Quarterly,* 1898, p. 565.

‡ C. R. XXVI., 345. In Article XVIII., instead of: Per verbum spiritus sanctus concipitur, we have: Sanctum spiritum concipimus, cum verbo Dei assentimur.

reason to believe that Melanchthon meant to present a *new* doctrine of the Lord's Supper, or that he meant to favor or to allure the Sacramentarians. In the Confession as read before the Emperor, and in the two earlier Latin editions, it was necessary to repel Eck's charge of sacramentarianism. Hence the "et improbant secus docentes." * In the "*Invariata*" and in the older editions the tenth Article had not, either expressly, or by implication, rejected the doctrine of Transubstantiation, nor had it expressed any dissent therefrom, and the Catholics had interpreted it, as they still do, in the sense of Transubstantiation. Were they to be left forever under the impression that the Lutheran fundamental Confession favored, or at least did not differ from, the Roman Catholic Church in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper? † And as regards the Zwinglians and their theological *confrerès* it must be recalled that in the year 1536 the Wittenbergers and the theologians of South Germany had come to an agreement on the Lord's Supper and had together subscribed the Wittenberg Concord,‡ in which in the Article on the Lord's Supper we have the same pivotal words, *exhiberi* and *cum pane et vino*, which particularly distinguish the *Variata* from the "*Invariata*," and from the older Latin editions; and sacramentarianism was no longer in the purview. Hence there was absolutely no call for the "et improbant secus docentes." Moreover, by exchanging the word *distribuantur* for *exhibeantur*, Melanchthon brought the Confession, as it regards the administration of the sacraments, into harmony with itself, for in Article VIII., we have this very same identical word *exhibeantur* in all the Latin editions, where it is said: "The sacraments and the Word on account of the appointment and command of Christ are effective although administered (*exhibeantur*) by evil men," and in Article XIII.: "Which are presented (*exhibeantur*) by the sacraments." Again and again is the same word employed in Article VII., *Of the Lord's Supper*, in the Formula of Concord, in all which places, as well as in Article X. of the *Variata*,

* "They disapprove those who teach otherwise."

† Salig is undeniably correct when he says: "The papists believed that the Lutherans were entirely at one with them on this point and taught transubstantiation." *Historie Augs. Conf.*, III., p. 471. And von Bezold, an Erlangen professor, has written: "In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper a form was selected that is so ambiguous that the Catholic theologians could only regret the lack of an express recognition of transubstantiation." *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation*, 1890, p. 620. For confirmation from the Catholic side that the Catholics approved Article X. of the "*Invariata*" and rejected and condemned Article X. of the *Variata*, see Fabricius's *Harmonia Conf. Augustanae*, second edition (1587), pp. 188-9.

‡ C. R. III., 75 *et seqq.* Von Ranke, vol. 5, p. 323.

the word means administered. It is also used in the same sense in the Würtemberg *Confession of Faith.** And this same word is used by the Lutheran dogmaticians more frequently than all other words taken together to set forth the doctrine that in the Lord's Supper, "the body and blood of Christ, that is, the Lord Jesus himself," † "are administered to those who eat in the Lord's Supper."

Also: In the *Variata* we have the words "bread and wine." This makes it impossible to construe the article in favor of Transubstantiation, as had been all along done by the Roman Catholics. Hence the Catholics have never accepted or approved Article X. of the *Variata,* and it was exactly this article which Eck instanced at Worms in 1541, when he alleged that the Confession had been changed. Also the use of the words, bread and wine, are fully in accord with the Lutheran teaching that in the Lord's Supper the bread remains bread, and the wine remains wine, and that with and by these media the body and blood of Christ are administered to those who eat in the supper. The word *vescentibus* is distinctively Lutheran as over against the Zwinglio-Calvinistic view—*credentibus.*‡

And as further evidence that Melanchthon did not mean to introduce a new doctrine into the *Variata,* we point to the fact that he changed not a single word in Article X. in any of the German *Variatae,* in all of which the article stands as it was read before the Emperor. And it must never be forgotten that the German Confession, since it was chosen by the Princes to be read, and was read, before the Emperor, must ever take precedence of the Latin as the Augsburg Confession. Rather must the Latin be regarded as the Augsburg Confession of the theologians, and the German as the Augsburg Confession of the Lutheran Church.

Hence, all things considered, it is not only gratuitous, but

* Pfaff, *Acta et Scripta,* pp. 340, 341. The word *distribuere* does not properly suit the subject in hand, and does not convey the proper Lutheran conception of the *Communion.* Hence Ernesti, in his *Praelectiones in Libros Symbolicos Ecclesiae Lutheranae,* anno 1752 et 1777, edited by J. M. Redling, 1877, very appropriately says: "Vocabulum *distribuere* h. l. non sensu ordinario nec proprio, sed crasiori accipi. Nam proprie est: per partes dividere, quod h. l. non convenit. Nam in s. coena quisque totum corpus accipit. P. 71.

† *Wittenberg Concord, ut supra,* p. 78.

‡ For a strong and positive vindication of Melanchthon's Lutheran soundness see *Melanchthon, the Theologian.* By Dr. H. E. Jacobs in *The Lutheran,* the official organ of the General Council, February 18, 1897, pp. 4, 5. Among other things, Dr. Jacobs says: "On the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, there is no evidence that he ever abandoned the explanation of Luther."

absolutely unhistorical, even anti-historical, to say, or to intimate, that Melanchthon changed Article X. in the Latin Confession on account of the Sacramentarians, or on account of their reputed successors, the Calvinists, in the later edition. And if the Calvinists chose to accept this article, the responsibility is with themselves, and they are to be commended for their agreement with the Lutherans in their repudiation of all ambiguity in regard to transubstantiation. The facts are simply these: The Romanists had found their doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the *"Invariata."* The Calvinists found their doctrine in the *Variata*. But in those days the cry of the *Gnesio-Lutherans* was: "Rather the Catholics than the Calvinists."

Consequently, in the absence of any contemporary evidence and testimony to the contrary, we must hold as Peucer and Selneccer testify, that "the meaning of the subjects is the same, although here and there in the later edition some things are rendered more explicit on account of the adversaries, or have been softened."* And in corroboration of such a conclusion we note the fact that this *Variata* went out accompanied by the Apology exactly in the form in which it had appeared in the octavo edition of 1531, in which Apology we read: "In the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present and are truly administered (exhibeantur), etc."† Surely, Melanchthon could not be guilty of such a glaring inconsistency as to betray the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Confession, and side by side to maintain it in the Apology in one of its most rigid and extreme forms of statement.

This *Variata* soon so far supplanted the Latin editions of 1531 that they became for a long time almost forgotten books. Immediately it was officially employed and defended at the Diet of Worms (1540-1), and again at the Diets of Ratisbon, 1541 and 1546. At the Colloquy of Worms in 1557 the *Variata* was not only presented to the Catholics as the Confession of the Lutherans, but it was made the basis of a Lutheran agreement that was signed by Lutheran theologians representing churches extending from Pomerania to Würtemberg. Luther called it "the dear Confession." John Brentz praised it highly. Chem-

* Selneccer, *ut supra*, fol. 97, who wrote in the year 1571. Peucer wrote in 1562.

† The Apology that accompanied the *editio princeps* and that which accompanied the octavo edition are absolutely identical in the use of these words. Even the abbreviations and the punctuation are absolutely identical.

nitz declared that "it was in everybody's hands," and both he and Selneccer valiantly defended it, and declared that it was used with the knowledge and approbation of Luther.*

But at the Colloquy in Weimar, Flacius, hard pressed in argument, and unable to refute his opponent, who had quoted from this *Variata,* said that Balthaser Winter had told him that George Rorer had told him that Luther was not pleased with Melanchthon's course in changing the Confession. It is almost superfluous to say that such an allegation is utterly without support. It is unhesitatingly denounced by historians as "an anti-Philippistic fabrication," invented by Flacius to cover the shame of defeat in argument. But, the fabrication now launched, in that day of suspicion and of theological jealousy and political animosity, the *Variata* became discredited. To satisfy the Flacianists, the authors of the Form of Concord decided to exclude everything that had been brought under the suspicion of being *Philippistic.* They proposed to return to *"that first and unaltered Augsburg Confession"* †—which, however, they did not do, and which has not yet been done, and which cannot now be done, for as we have said above, so we say here again, such a document as *"that first and unaltered Augsburg Confession"* is not known to exist anywhere in the world. The German *Textus Receptus* in the Formula of Concord is a faulty copy of an unsigned manuscript, and the Latin *editio princeps* is "a private work of Melanchthon," and is already a *varied* Augsburg Confession.

5. *The Latin Variata* of 1541-2.

Melanchthon was still not satisfied with the form which he

* See *The Lutheran Quarterly* for 1898, pp. 570-1. Weber, *ut supra,* II., pp. 333, 341, 343. Heppe, *Geschichte d. deutschen Protestantismus,* I., 208. Heppe, *Die Confessionelle Entwicklung,* p. 118. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom,* I., p. 241. Köllner's *Symbolik,* I., 233-4. Anton, *Geschichte der Concordiaformel,* pp. 79, 80. Weber, after an exhaustive inquiry into the history and text of the *Variatae,* writes: "And now what conclusion must we draw from all these historical facts? This and nothing else: In the *Variatae* Melanchthon has changed nothing in doctrine. Because Luther and the other co-reformers raised no objection, but, as the evidence shows, approved and sanctioned them, and because the Evangelical Church by presenting them in religious colloquies, and by authorizing them at conventions, introduced them into schools and took them into *corpora doctrinae,* they received symbolical authority." Vol. II., pp. 241-2. Long ago Strobel challenged the learned world to show any instance in which an evangelical theologian took exception to Melanchthon's changes in the Augsburg Confession prior to 1560. *Apologie Melanchthons,* p. 94. After prolonged researches we repeat Strobel's challenge. See Weber, *ut supra,* II., 508-9. *The Lutheran Quarterly,* Oct., 1898, p. 568.

† *Lichtenberg Bedenken;* Hutter, *Concordia Concors,* p. 78*b*; *Formula of Concord: The Compendious Form* of Doctrine.

had given the Confession of 1540. In the year 1541 he began, and in the year 1542 he finished and published another edition in octavo. The Apology is added. The title is word for word the same as that of the *Variata* of 1540, except that the place and date of publication appear after the Apology: IMPRESSUM VITEBERGAE *per Georgium Rhau.* M. D. XLII., and not at the bottom of the title-page.

In matter this *Variata* differs from that of 1540 very slightly in Articles IV., V., XI., XX., but considerably in Article XXI. In the Articles on Abuses there is considerable difference in Articles IV., V., VII.*

Of the Latin *Variatae* of the Augsburg Confession (1531, 1540, 1541-2), described above, we may speak in general, as we have spoken of the German *Variatae:* Each declares on the title-page that it is the Confession of Faith that was delivered to the Emperor Charles V. at Augsburg in the year 1530, and each is accompanied by the Apology, which is universally recognized as the best and most authoritative explanation of the Confession. The Lutheran doctrine has not been corrupted in the *Variatae,* but it has been clarified, amplified in statement, fortified by argument, rendered more decidedly Protestant, and more distinctively Lutheran. The "*Invariata*" did not properly represent the Lutheran doctrine in opposition to the Roman Catholic dogmatic tradition, as is clearly shown by the different confutations, by the agreements reached in the celebrated Committee of Fourteen,† by the exclamation of Christopher von Stadion, Bishop of Augsburg: *Quae recitata sunt, vera sunt, pura sunt veritas, non possumus inficiari,*‡ and by that of the Emperor himself: *Protestantes in fidei articulis non errare.*§

Such a confession could not have formed the *fundamentum* of a great Protestant Church, but rather a convenient bridge for crossing to the right bank of the Tiber. Thanks to Melanchthon! The deficiencies and ambiguities that every theologian encounters in the *editio princeps,* to say nothing about the "*Invariata,*" are removed by the later *Variatae,* which, for almost fifty years, supplanted the *editio princeps,* and helped to determine the meaning of the Augsburg Confession and to distinguish the Lutheran doctrine. Consistency would require that in aban-

* See Weber, *ut supra,* II., 109-111. C. R. XXVI., 345-347. Jacobs, *Book of Concord,* II., 147 *et seqq.*

† *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1907, pp. 374 *et seqq.*

‡ Walch, *Introductio,* p. 176.

§ Coelestin, IV., p. 109. See also Wiedemann's *Dr. Johann Eck,* p. 270.

doning these by a backward step, we should go clear back to "*that first and unaltered Augsburg Confession,* delivered to the Emperor Charles V. at Augsburg in the year 1530," which they thought they were doing who authorized and introduced the change. But had they not deceived themselves by allowing themselves to be deceived, it is hard to believe that they themselves could have thought of subscribing the Confession in the form in which it was delivered to the Emperor, June 25, 1530, and we cannot conceive that it would be possible to find a Lutheran body to-day which could be induced to subscribe the Augsburg Confession in that form, were it made possible to do so.

Hence the thanks of the entire Lutheran Church are due to Melanchthon for his *Variatae.* He represents progress and adaptation in the Lutheran Church; and in the fact that Luther and his co-reformers approved and endorsed his changes and adaptations, and made them their own, we have the positive proof that the authority of the Confession, in their estimation, was not to be sought in the letter, or in any particular form of words, but in the content and in the conception of doctrine.

The man who wrote the Augsburg Confession and the men, his contemporaries, who endorsed and approved it, did not think that it was perfect.* Much rather did they hold that it was capable of being improved, and they acted accordingly. In the *editio princeps* they gave us an *improved* Augsburg Confession, a confession that can stand, and that for nearly four hundred years has stood, as the distinctive *fundamentum* of a great Church. In this form the Augsburg Confession has had its widest recognition, but in this form it is not the *Confessio Augustana Invariata*, and no intelligent theologian, not blinded by prejudice, would claim for it any such distinction, or would exhibit it as the *proper* and *intended* antithesis to the *Variata* of 1540, since it is itself a *variata,* and since it was not in the purview when the authors of the Formula of Concord invented their distinction: "*That first and unaltered Augsburg Confession*, which," they say, "was most carefully *collated* by trustworthy persons with the genuine *Original* which was delivered

* After speaking of the Augsburg Confession as the purest and the most genuinely Christian manifestation of the Latin Church, Von Ranke writes: "It need scarcely be added that it was not meant to be set forth as a norm for all time. It was only a statement of a fact. 'Our churches teach; it is taught; it is unanimously taught; we are falsely accused.' These are the expressions used by Melanchthon. He wishes only to express the conviction which had been already developed." *Deutsche Geschichte,* 7th Ed., vol. 3, p. 175.

to the Emperor, and which remains in the keeping of the Holy Empire; and since the Latin and German copies were both found everywhere to be of the same meaning, we will confess to no other,'' * and then took into their ''Christian Book of Concord,'' for the German, a text ''without authentic value'' and ''through and through inaccurate,'' and for the Latin, first, Melanchthon's octavo edition, and then the *editio princeps,* ''a private work of Melanchthon,'' † a *variata.*

* Preface to the Book of Concord, Dresden, 1580.
† Von Ranke, 7th Ed., vol. 3, p. 175, note. Tschackert, *ut supra,* p. 61.

CHAPTER XV.

THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION FROM 1530 TO 1555.

It must never be forgotten that the Imperial Proclamation which summoned the Diet of Augsburg, *anno* 1530, declared that one object of said Diet was to consult and to decide on certain dissensions and disturbances in regard to the Holy Faith. There is no reason to believe that Charles was insincere in his declaration that "both parties" should be heard in love, and that every effort should be made to effect reconciliation and to promote unity in doctrine and in Christian living. To what extent either party was animated by love in the discussions that ensued will always be a subject of dispute. Neither will Protestants and Catholics ever agree in locating the responsibility for the failure of the Diet in attaining its main purpose.

1. *The Recess of the Diet.*

But there is every reason to believe that the Lutherans took Charles at his word, and that they did all that their consciences would allow them to do in order to come to a perfect agreement with their religious opponents. Indeed, it is now conceded by all fair-minded historians, competent to judge, that the Lutheran concessions at Augsburg imperiled the evangelical cause. Still, peace was not made, though only two or three points, and those appertaining to ceremonies rather than to doctrine—communion under both forms, the marriage of priests, the Canon of the Mass—separated the two parties.* The Papists would be satisfied with nothing short of absolute submission to the papal see, and of the restoration by the Protestants of the entire papal system of doctrines and ceremonies. The Lutherans, inspired by Luther at the moment of supreme peril, refused compliance with such unjust and unreasonable demands, and withdrew from further negotiations. This action of the Lutherans only intensified the determination of the papal and imperial party to suppress the Lutheran and other heresies, and to restore unity to Western Christendom. What friendly negotiations had failed to

* Gieseler, *Church History*, IV., 145-6. Plitt, *Apologie der Augustana*, p. 51. *The Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1900.

accomplish was now to be accomplished by political methods, by a general council of the Church, and, if need be, by the cruel expedient of war.

Finally, on the nineteenth of November, 1530, the Imperial Recess, or Decree, of the Diet was issued. This famous document begins by reciting that the Diet had been called for the purpose of procuring and promoting harmony "in the one Christian religion, so that all might live together in fellowship and unity in the one Christian Church;" and that six Princes, namely, the Elector of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg, Ernest and Francis Dukes of Brunswick-Lüneburg, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Wolfgang Prince of Anhalt, and the legates of six cities, namely, Nürnberg, Reutlingen, Kempten, Heilbronn, Windsheim and Weissenburg in Nordgau, had presented their Confession of Faith; that said Confession of Faith had been thoroughly confuted out of the Gospel and Holy Scriptures, and yet the aforesaid Princes had not allied themselves with the other Princes and Estates, and "agreed with us in all the articles." "Therefore consulting for the welfare, peace and harmony of the Holy Empire and of the German Nation, out of special imperial goodness and clemency we have made known to the aforesaid Elector, Princes and cities the following decree, and have clemently entreated that it be accepted by them: Namely, that between this day and the fifteenth of next April, they should consider whether or not they will unanimously hold and profess identically concerning the disputed articles (*de articulis non conciliatis;* German: Der unvergleichenden Artikel halben) with the Catholic Church, the Papal Holiness, and with the other Electors, Princes and Estates of the Holy Empire, and with the other heads and members of the Christian world until the decision of the Council, and inform us under their seals of their intention before the date above-named:—meanwhile we will consider what duty requires of us, and will in turn report to them our purpose. During the period of deliberation some very just articles and conditions are to be observed, viz.: We earnestly will and enjoin that the Elector of Saxony and his allies in this matter of religion, in the interval, shall take care that nothing new be printed and sold on the subject of religion in their dominions and territories, and that during this interval the Electors, Princes and Estates of the Holy Empire, preserve peace and harmony, and that the Elector of Saxony, these five Princes, and the six cities, and their subjects, shall not invite nor force our

subjects of the Holy Empire, or of other Electors, Princes and Orders, as has heretofore been done, into their own fellowship and that of their sect. Moreover, should any subjects of the Elector of Saxony, of the five Princes and six cities, of whatever rank or condition, still adhere or wish to adhere to the ancient Catholic Faith and Religion, it is to be free and safe for all such in their churches and chapels to observe their worship and ceremonies; and they shall not be forced to make any further innovations. Likewise monks and nuns in Masses, in saying and hearing confession, in administering and receiving the Lord's Supper, are not to be interfered with. Also the said Elector of Saxony, the five Princes and six cities, are to ally themselves with us and the other Electors, Princes and Estates against the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists, and are not to separate themselves from us and the other Electors and Princes, but by counsel, work and assistance are to promote whatever is to be done against them, as all our Electors, Princes and Estates, as far as in them lies, have promised us that they will do in this matter." *

Analyzing that portion of the Imperial Recess quoted above, we discover that it is directed against the signers of the Augsburg Confession; that it offers the signers of that Confession five months in which to submit themselves to papal jurisdiction, with the clearly implied threat that if at the end of that time they still persist in their opposition, the powers of the Empire will be turned against them; that nothing new on the subject of religion is to be printed or circulated; that no efforts are to be made to increase the number of the Protestants; that the adherents of the old faith are to enjoy the full privilege of worshiping according to the old forms, and that these signers of the Confession are to assist in the suppression of the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists.

The Recess then proceeds to promise that a general council shall be summoned within the next six months, or at the longest within one year after the close of the Diet, for the purpose of considering the spiritual and temporal affairs of the Christian world, and for restoring peace and unity.

Next follows a discussion of the *Confessio Tetrapolitana*, which declares that that document has been thoroughly refuted out of the Scriptures, and commands the four cities, Strassburg, Constance, Memmingen and Lindau, which had presented it, to submit to the Catholic Church. This is succeeded by a lengthy

* Latin in Chytraeus's *Historia Augustanae Confessionis*, pp. 389-408. German in Walch, XVI., 1924 *et seqq.*

review of the entire ecclesiastical situation. We give the excellent summary made by Sleidan: "The Decree was read in the assembly of all the States, the Emperor being present; wherein, after a recapitulation of all the proceedings, the Emperor enacted and decreed, that they should not be tolerated for the future, who taught otherwise of the Lord's Supper, than had hitherto been observed; that nothing should be changed in public or private Mass; that children should be confirmed with *Chrism,* and sick people anointed with consecrated oil; that pictures and images should not be removed, and where they had been taken away should be restored; that the opinion of those who denied man's free-will should not be received, because it was brutish, and reproachful to God; that nothing should be taught, which might in any manner or way lessen the authority and dignity of the magistrate; that that doctrine of man's justification by faith alone should not be admitted; that the sacraments of the Church should be the same in number, and have the same veneration, as anciently; that all the rites and ceremonies of the Church, the offices for the dead, and the like, should be observed; that vacant benefices should be conferred on fit persons; that priests and churchmen, who were married, should be turned out of their livings, which immediately after this Diet should be given to others; but that such as forsaking their wives, should return to their former state, and desire to be absolved, might be restored by their Bishops, with consent of the Pope or his Legate; that as for the rest they should have no refuge or sanctuary, but be banished, or otherwise condignly punished; that the priests should lead honest lives, wear decent apparel, and avoid giving scandal; that all unreasonable compacts and agreements that priests have been anywhere forced to make, and that all unjust sale also of church-good, or the application of the same to profane uses, should be void and null; that no man should be admitted to preach, but he that had an authentic testimony from a Bishop of the soundness of his doctrine and conversation; that all should observe the rule here prescribed in preaching, and not venture upon that expression in sermons, *that some were endeavoring to stifle the light of the Gospel;* that they should also forbear flouting and reviling; that they should exhort the people to hear Mass, be diligent in prayer, to invoke the Virgin Mary, and the rest of the saints, keep holidays, fast, abstain from meats prohibited, and relieve the poor; that they should put it home to monks and other religious, that it was not lawful to forsake their order and profes-

sion; in short, that nothing should be changed in those things that concerned the faith and worship of God; that they who acted otherwise should forfeit lives and goods; that what had been taken from the clergy should be restored; that in those places where monasteries and other religious houses had been demolished, they should be rebuilt, and the usual rites and ceremonies performed in them; that they who within the territories of the adversaries, followed the ancient faith and religion, and submitted to this decree, should be taken into the protection of the Empire, and have liberty to depart whithersoever they pleased without any prejudice; that application should be made to the Pope about a council, and that within six months he would call one to meet in a convenient place, there to begin with the first opportunity, and within a year at the farthest. That all these things should be firm and stable, notwithstanding any exceptions or appeals made or to be made to the contrary; that to the end this decree might be observed and put into execution, in as far as it concerns faith and religion, all men should be obliged to employ whatever fortune God hath been pleased to bestow upon them, and their blood and lives besides; and that if any man should attempt anything against another by force, that the Imperial Chamber, upon complaint thereof made, should warn the party that used force, or offered hostility, to desist, and sue his adversary at law; that if he obeyed not he should be prosecuted criminally, and to an outlawry, which being published, the neighboring Princes and cities should be charged and commanded forthwith to give aid or assistance to him that was in fear of being assaulted; but that no man should be admitted into the judicature of the chamber, unless he approved this Decree made about religion, and that they who refused to do it should be turned out." *

The language of the Recess is mild and respectful; but its tone is firm and decided. It leaves no room for doubt as to the result in case of disobedience. Forcible measures are clearly intimated. And as to contents, it is virtually a confession of faith. At the opening of the Diet the Catholic Princes had declined to present a confession, or a statement of their faith, alleging that they adhered to the faith of the Church. This Recess, which in its spirit and matter is the work of the Catholic Princes and theologians, inspired largely by the papal legates, rather than the work of the Emperor, furnished the positive

* *De Statu Religionis*, etc., pp. 114, 115; Bohun's Translation, pp. 139, 140.

proof that no concessions would be made by the Catholic party, and that in doctrine, worship and jurisdiction, the Papacy was determined to permit no changes and no reformation in Germany. It also exhibited a programme for future action. In a word, it was the Catholic *manifesto*, and it set up a clear line of demarcation between the two parties.

2. *The Protestant Alliance.*

The signers of the two confessions had the choice, simply, between submission and resistance. What were they to do? Their consciences were doubly bound. They could not renounce God's Word, and repudiate the good confession they had witnessed at Augsburg. And hitherto it had been held that it was not lawful to form a league against the Emperor and to defend their faith with arms. But necessity knows no law. Besides, the jurists at Wittenberg had decided that the Emperor had transcended his jurisdiction. "To obey the Emperor in his mandates and commands against the Word of God would be an unpardonable and irreparable offense. Hence, in matters of faith and of evangelical truth, we must obey God rather than man. Moreover, the Emperor has no jurisdiction in matters of faith. But he has the power to proclaim and assemble a council if the Pope be slow and negligent. He has not the power and authority to ordain anything. What a council has decreed and ordained, that he may administer and execute."

The jurists also had decided that as the Protestants had appealed to a council, execution of a process was unlawful. This principle holds in civil matters. "Much more does it have place in matters of faith that involve the salvation of souls, and also in matters of marriage. Hence in the matter of our Christian faith the Emperor is not a judge, but only a private person, to whom belongs cognition and the maintenance of the law. That is, he had no right to judge and to ordain what men shall believe and hold. He has no right of execution where the matter has not first been heard, discussed, and determined in a council. A judge who has jurisdiction and power to decide a cause may be resisted when he proceeds contrary to law, or after an appeal has been taken. How much more then a judge who has no jurisdiction in a cause? And when he has jurisdiction, that is suspended by an appeal. A judge who has gone beyond the limits of his jurisdiction may be disobeyed without punishment."

This *Opinion* of the jurists was made the basis of an official

Opinion by Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen, Amsdorf and Melanchthon: "We conclude that it is the duty of every Prince to protect Christians, and the proper external worship of God, against all unlawful violence just as in civil matters it is the duty of a Prince to protect a pious subject against unjust violence. Much more is this duty incumbent upon Princes, since the Scriptures often enjoin upon Princes the protection of lawful preachers and teachers. . . . Therefore it is without doubt the duty of Princes to protect and guard Christian subjects, Christian doctrine and the lawful public worship." They further declare that should the Emperor apply force while the appeal is pending, it is the duty of Princes to resist such manifest illegality, for all intelligent persons know that the Emperor ought to sustain the appeal.

This *Opinion* is a strong and positive declaration of the right and duty of the Princes to resist the Recess of the Diet and all that it implied. The judgment is based upon the most fundamental principles of the common law, upon Scripture and upon the dictates of reason, and is supported by appeals to history. A little later they issue another *Opinion* in a similar spirit, and use very vigorous language in the support of their position: "There is no doubt that it is the duty of every father to protect his wife and child against open murder. And there is no difference between a secret murderer and the Emperor, when the latter proposes unlawful violence beyond his jurisdiction, and especially unlawful violence in public matters. For violence in public matters removes all obligations between subject and ruler *jure naturae*. Likewise in this case, if the ruler wishes to drive the subject to blasphemy and idolatry." *

The case was now clear to the mind of the Elector. It was legally and morally right for him to protect his subjects from unjust violence and to save them from the horrors of religious persecution. Consequently, when on November 28th he received a letter from the Emperor commanding him to appear at Cologne by December 21st, "about difficult and weighty affairs, relating to the public," and on the same day a letter from the Archbishop of Mayence informing him that the Emperor desired him to come to Cologne for the purpose of taking part in electing a King of the Romans, he forthwith despatched letters to the Landgrave of Hesse and to the rest of the Evangelical Princes and cities, praying them to assemble at Schmalkald, December

* Walch, X., 660 *et seqq.* Erl. Ed., 64: 269 *et seqq.*

22d. Meanwhile he despatched his son, John Frederick, to Cologne to protest against the election of Ferdinand as King of the Romans. He charged his son to represent that the citation by the Archbishop of Mayence had not been legally made, and that the creation of a King of the Romans was a signal violation of the rights of the Empire, and of the statute of Charles V.

December 22d, the Elector in person, the Landgrave of Hesse, Ernest Duke of Brunswick, Wolfgang Prince of Anhalt, Gebhard and Albert, Counts of Mansfeld, and representatives of Strassburg, Nürnberg, Constance, Ulm, Magdeburg, Bremen, Reutlingen, Heilbronn, Memmingen, Lindau, Kempten, Isny, Biberach, Windsheim and Weissenberg in the Nordgau, and of George Margrave of Brandenburg, met at Schmalkald, and made the first draft of a league of mutual defense.

It was resolved that in case any attempt should be made to enforce the Recess, whether under pretext of law or in any other way, "on matters of our holy faith, or on things appertaining thereto," all should stand by and assist the one accused; that an appeal should be taken against the Recess; that inasmuch as they had been accused of "having been vacillating in their Confession and conduct at Augsburg," they would prepare a report of the transactions at Augsburg in Latin and French, and send the same to the Kings of England and France and to other sovereigns as a justification of their course; that a committee should be appointed to consider the propriety of establishing a uniform order of rites and ceremonies, since they had been accused of abolishing all ceremonies in worship, and of neglecting Church discipline.*

This Draft was signed, December 31st, by all the Princes present, by Magdeburg and Bremen. The representatives of the other cities promised to report to their principals, and to announce their decision within six weeks.

3. *The Schmalkald League.*

Thus was formed the famous Schmalkald League, which was destined to perform so important a part in the cause of the Reformation. Its object, as stated in the Draft, was "by the grace and help of God to defend and maintain our holy faith and whatever appertains thereto." The *faith* meant was that confessed at Augsburg, and that that had been preached in their churches, and that prevailed in their dominions. It was a league formed for the protection of the Evangelical faith against all

* Original in Walch, XVI., 2141 *et seqq.*

that was implied in the Imperial Recess of November 19th. Von Ranke is not extravagant when he writes: "These nine days may be reckoned among the most important in the history of the world. The threatened and despised minority, under the influence of a religious idea on which depended the future development of the human mind, assumed an energetic and even warlike attitude. They determined, in like manner as they had confessed the new doctrine and refused to abandon it, so they would now defend the whole position into which that Confession had led them—by legal means, in the first place; but if necessary by arms; as to the former, all were agreed; as to the latter, the majority (some still entertained scruples as to their legal right); and thus at the very origin of the innovation, a compact and determined union was formed for its maintenance, which its antagonists were likely to find it difficult to overcome." *

Truly is it said that it was a *religious idea* that influenced these lay confessors of Christianity. The Draft contains not one word that looks toward the protection of themselves in their civil rights. Everything has reference to their *holy faith;* and at the same time they sought peace, and not war. Their own words furnish the best evidence of the devoutness of spirit with which they enter this alliance. Hear their supplication: For all this may our Lord God grant his Holy Spirit, wisdom, grace, strength, power, and eternal steadfastness, and in addition grant to the Christian Estates, and to the whole Christian world, peace, and that everything may redound to his praise and glory; and to that end the Estates shall and will have devout and hearty prayer offered to God the Almighty in the churches of all their principalities and dominions."

Just what place was accorded to the Augsburg Confession at this first convention at Schmalkald is not a matter of record, since it is not named in the plan. But that membership with the League was in some sense determined by the subscriber's relation to the Augsburg Confession is shown by the fact that "Strassburg was instructed to invite Zürich, Berne and Basel to join, provided they acknowledged the Augsburg Confession." †

But Cardinal Hergenröther is supported by official authority when he says: "The Saxon had Zürich, Berne and Basel invited to enter the league on the condition that in reference to the

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

* *Deutsche Geschichte*, 3, p. 228.
† Seckendorf, II., Book III., p. 3.

Lord's Supper they accept the Strassburg Confession,'' * that is, the *Confessio Tetrapolitana;* for Jacob Sturm, in his report of the Schmalkald Convention, written December 17th to 31st, makes this distinct declaration, and also says that when the Strassburg legates to that Convention were interviewed by the Saxon counsellor and others on the subject of the Lord's Supper, they gave answer and *presented the Strassburg Confession.*† This makes it documentarily certain that there was now some moderation of intensity in regard to the tenth Article. Besides, in accepting the *Augustana* the Strassburgers did not give up the *Tetrapolitana.*‡ The union was a general one on the basis of the Augsburg Confession, but was not exclusive, and did not extend to minute points. Even the *Tetrapolitana* was expressly recognized as in harmony with the Word of God.§ Only gradually did the *Tetrapolitana* cease to have authority at Strassburg, and it was not until 1598 that Strassburg became a Lutheran city in the real sense of the word *Lutheran.*

4. *The Purpose of the Schmalkald League.*

But as already intimated, this first meeting at Schmalkald was only preliminary. Its general purpose is evident, though the Draft lacks distinctness of statement. On the twenty-seventh of February, 1531, the same Princes, and, in the main, the same cities, declare still more plainly, that it is their duty to have the Word of God preached to their subjects, and not to allow it to be suppressed or to be violently wrested from their subjects; that they will faithfully and sincerely stand by each other, and will neither secretly nor openly enter into hostile relations with each other; that they will firmly stand together in defense of ''the Word of God, the evangelical doctrine and our holy faith''; that this league is not formed in opposition to the Emperor or to any other person, ''but alone for the maintenance of the Christian faith, and of peace in the Holy Empire of the German Nation and for the repulsion of unjust violence from ourselves, our subjects and allies, and alone for defense and pro-

* Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte,* IX., 777.

† *Strassburger Politische Correspondenz,* p. 569. See also Winkelmann, *Der Schmalkaldische Bund,* pp. 91, 101. They were not even required expressly to renounce the Zwinglians. Kawerau, III., 118.

‡ Ambrose Wolf, *Historia von der Augsburgischen Confession,* p. 292; Heppe, III., p. 315; *Realencyclopädie,*[2] XV., p. 356; Plitt, *Apologie,* p. 256, *notes.*

§ Hefele, IX., 777.

tection." It was also decided that this League should stand for six years.*

It will thus be seen that the fundamental and primary object of the Schmalkald League was the defense of the Gospel. And while the Augsburg Confession is not mentioned in this second Recess of the League, it is true, nevertheless, that the Confession forms the point of contact of all who unite in the League, and embraces the conception of "the evangelical doctrine," and "of the Christian truth," for the defense of which the League was called into existence. In other words, the Confession delivered at Augsburg, June 25, 1530, has now become the bond of a larger and of a more determined evangelical union than that represented by the original subscribers. On that Confession as a declaration of evangelical truth all those Princes and cities who were dissatisfied with the old ecclesiastical *régime* were resolved to defend themselves and their subjects against all hostile attacks of the Empire or of the Church. And it is gratifying to learn that in this position and determination they had the endorsement of the Wittenberg theologians, who, in reviewing the transactions of Schmalkald, say: "In doctrine there can and should be no departure from the Confession; for Christ says: 'Whosoever confesses me before men,' etc. These subjects of dispute have reference to the chief part of the Christian doctrine. Should these be obscured or renounced, then no one can know what Christ is; Christ will be defamed, and consciences can have no true comfort." They repel the charge that they have abolished all ceremonies, or have pronounced all ceremonies impious. But they steadfastly declare, in accordance with the unvarying Lutheran conception of the Gospel, that ceremonies are not to be regarded as necessary to salvation, and are a matter of Christian liberty. "To an extent and for the sake of children and simple people they must be observed. But the Canon of the Mass, and the *Applicatio operis operati pro vivis et defunctis*, and the Private Masses, and the sacrament under one kind, are not approved." †

5. *The Confessional Basis.*

And that both the Leaguers and the Wittenberg theologians became stronger in their determination to stand upon their evangelical platform is shown by two important facts:

1. When the League was renewed, in the year 1536, only

* Original in Walch, XVI., 2169 *et seqq.* Winckelmann, p. 92.
† Walch, XVI., 2174 *et seqq.*

those were to be admitted "who hold by the Word of God and the Gospel, and the pure doctrine of our Confession that was delivered to the Emperor and to all the estates, and who have the same taught and preached in their lands." *

2. When Henry the Eighth of England was aspiring to be placed at the head of the Schmalkald League, the Leaguers expressly require "that the Most Serene King shall promote the Gospel of Christ and the pure doctrine of faith in the manner in which the Princes and Confederate Estates confessed it in the Diet at Augsburg, and have guarded it in the published Apology, unless perhaps with the common consent of the Most Serene King and the Princes themselves, some things should seem to need change in accordance with the Word of God.

"Also that the Most Serene King shall guard and defend the said doctrine of the Gospel and ceremonies as conformed to the Gospel in a future General Council, provided it (the Council) be pious, catholic, free and truly Christian." †

And at the Saalfeld (October 24, 1531) and Schweinfurt (April 2-5, 1532) conventions, which grew out of the Schmalkald League, and in *The Nürnberg Religious Peace* (July 23, 1532), the Lutherans made no deviation from the basis agreed upon at Schmalkald, except that they added the Apology "as a defense and explanation of the Confession." ‡

6. *The Religious Colloquies.*

1. In the Colloquy held at Wittenberg in the year 1536, between the Wittenberg theologians and the theologians of Upper Germany, it was solemnly declared, May 29th: "But since they all (the subscribers) profess that in all the articles they wish to hold and to teach according to the Confession and Apology of the Princes who profess the Gospel, we especially desire that concord be ordained and established." §

2. At Schmalkald, February, 1537, thirty-three doctors and preachers declare: "We have re-read the articles of the Confession presented to the Emperor at the Diet of Augsburg,|| and by the blessing of God all the preachers who have been present in this Schmalkald Convention do unanimously declare that in

* Hortleder, I., 1503.

† C. R. II., 1032.

‡ Winckelmann, *Der Schmalkaldische Bund*, pp. 192 *et seqq.*, and 305; Sleidan, p. 128*b*; Eng. Translation, pp. 159, 160.

§ C. R. II., 75, 76.

|| The German *Variata* of 1533 was employed at Schmalkald. Weber, II., 71 *et seqq.* C. R. XXVI., 699.

their churches they hold and teach according to the articles of the Confession and Apology. They also declare that they approve the article on the primacy of the Pope and his power, and on the power and jurisdiction of the Bishops which here at Schmalkald has been presented to the Princes in this convention." *

3. At a convention held in Schmalkald in March, 1540, attended by the representatives of Princes and cities, and by theologians, proposals were received for the admission of Henry VIII. of England to the Schmalkald League, and a large sum of money was suggested for the support of the League in case of agreement in doctrine. After a few days the Lutheran theologians gave a written response to the ambassadors: "The sum of it all was this: That they ought not to depart from the contents of the Augsburg Confession nor of the Apology which was afterwards annexed to it. This *Opinion* all the divines who were absent afterwards approved by their letters to the convention." †

4. June 25, 1540, a colloquy between the Catholics and the Lutherans was opened at Hagenau. The former demanded of the latter that they present in brief form the heads of the controverted doctrines. The latter replied as follows: "That the Confession of their faith and Apology had been presented at Augsburg ten years before, to which they still adhered, being ready to satisfy any that found fault with it; and since they knew not what it was that their adversaries chiefly censured in that book, they had nothing to propound, but rather were to demand of them what the doctrines were that they taught contrary to the Word of God." ‡

5. The Colloquy of Worms, which was but the adjourned Colloquy of Hagenau, was opened November 25th.§ It had been decreed at Hagenau that the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession should be made the subjects of discussion. The Lutherans insisted upon the execution of this Decree, and accordingly laid down their Confession, the *Variata* of 1540, and declared themselves prepared to defend it. When Eck complained of the

* Müller, *Die Symb. Bücher,* 10th Ed., p. 345. The Tractate on the Power and Primacy of the Pope was written at Schmalkald by Melanchthon.

† Sleidan, p. 197*b;* Eng. Tr., p. 255. Seckendorf, Lib. III., 258. See C. R. III., 961, 973. Lindsay, *A History of the Reformation,* II., p. 341. See *Die Wittenberger Artikel von 1536,* edited by Mentz, Leipzig, 1905, which Seckendorf called a "*Repetitio et exegesis quaedam Augustanae Confessionis.*" Lib. III., p. 111.

‡ Sleidan, p. 206; Eng. Tr., p. 267. See Seckendorf, Lib. III., 265.

§ November 25, 1540; January 14-18, 1541.

changes that had been made in the Confession, Melanchthon at once replied: "The meaning of the subjects is the same, though in the later edition some things have been more mildly expressed or have been better explained." * The *Variata* was then used as the basis of the discussion that followed. Of the thirty-two evangelical legates present at Worms, not one raised objection to the use of the *Variata*. Hence it was at this Worms Colloquy that the *Variata* of 1540 first received *official* and *formal* recognition as the Augsburg Confession.

6. On January 18th, the Worms Colloquy was adjourned to meet at Regensburg (Ratisbon) in the following Spring. In official documents presented to the Emperor the Lutherans declared their adherence to the Augsburg Confession in clear and unqualified language, as: "This entire kind of doctrine, which is set forth in our churches, and which exists in our Confession and Apology, is the doctrine which is handed down in the Gospel and in the consensus of the Catholic Church of Christ." "Again we testify that we embrace the Confession which was delivered to his Imperial Majesty at Augsburg and the Apology which was added." "We, the legates of the Elector, the Princes, and estates, and the counsellors and legates of those absent, who follow the Augsburg Confession and the religion therein contained." †

The Augsburg Confession presented at Regensburg was the *Variata*,‡ which is recognized as the Confession that was presented to the Emperor at Augsburg, and that, too, with the knowledge and consent of Luther, and it was while this Diet was in session that Luther wrote to the Elector that the Lutheran legates at the Diet "are standing by the dear Confession." §

These six instances (and others could be adduced) show that the Lutherans stood by their Augsburg Confession with all fidelity. They were firmly convinced that that Confession contained the doctrine delivered in the Gospel. But they did not

* C. R. IV., 34. The Elector of Saxony charged his commissioners to the Worms Colloquy: "That they were to stand by the Confession and Apology in word and in sense, as they had been recently approved again at Schmalkald by all the Estates and their allies in religion." Weber, II., p. 318. *Realencyclopädie*,[2] V., 537. The German copy presented at Worms was substantially a reprint of the German *Variata* of 1533. See Weber, II., 318, 320, 321, and *The Lutheran Quarterly*, Oct., 1897, pp. 562 *et seqq.*

† See C. R. IV., pp. 413-431, especially p. 431 and p. 434; pp. 478, 483. Bucer, *Acta Colloquii in Com. Imp. Ratisbonae*, k. iiii. and l. iiii. Cochlaeus says of the Lutherans at this Diet: "Ad suam Confessionem Augustanam ejusque Apologiam alligabant fidem suam." *Commentaria*, p. 302.

‡ Schmidt, *Philipp Melanchthon*, pp. 373-4, note.

§ De Wette, V., 357.

tie themselves to the letter of the Confession. They had not brought with them from Augsburg a certified or engrossed copy of their Confession. They had delivered the Augsburg Confession to the Emperor, and it was not now accessible to them. In strictness of speech, *they* did not have an Augsburg Confession. They had only uncertified copies of the said Confession. But Melanchthon's *editio princeps* was at once accepted as the Augsburg Confession. This was soon supplanted in use by the Latin octavo edition of 1531, and by the German *Variata* of 1533; and these again by the *Variatae* of 1540.* All these editions alike bore the superscription: "Delivered to his Imperial Majesty at Augsburg in the year 1530." Theologians and Princes accepted them and defended them, as from time to time they were published, as the Augsburg Confession. They laid no stress on the letter, but on the substance and content of doctrine. In the later editions they found a better explanation of the evangelical doctrine than had been put in the earlier forms.

7. In the Spring of 1551 Melanchthon, under instruction from the Elector Maurice, wrote the *Repetition of the Augsburg Confession* for presentation at the Council of Trent, in case it should be deemed expedient to send commissioners to the council. In the first paragraph of the Preface it is declared: "We mean simply and faithfully to reiterate the sum of the doctrine which is preached in all the churches that embrace the Confession of the Reverend Dr. Luther, and we repeat the doctrine of the Confession which was presented to the Emperor Charles at the Diet of Augsburg in the year 1530, although some things are here more fully recited." † This *Repetition,* known also as *Confessio Saxonica,* was endorsed and approved by synods, universities, superintendents and theologians from Pomerania to Strassburg, and was incorporated in several *Corpora Doctrinae.*‡

8. In May, 1554, a convention of Lutherans was held at Naumburg for the purpose of formulating Articles of Faith to be presented to the next Imperial Diet, and to oppose a common declaration to the errors of Osiander and Schwenckfeld. Here, on the 24th, a declaration, written by Melanchthon, was presented and signed. In the first paragraph it is said: "We appeal to the published and well-known Confession which was delivered to his Imperial Majesty at Augsburg in the year 1530,

* Schmidt, *Philipp Melanchthon,* pp. 373-4, note.
† C. R. XXVIII., 327 *et seqq.*
‡ C. R. XXVIII., 457-468.

and by which our churches through the grace of God still stand, because they know that this is the sole, eternal consensus of the Holy Scriptures and of the true Catholic Church of Christ." The subscribers declare that they will not depart from this Confession, and that either it, or the Confession of Brentz, or the *Saxon,* may be delivered to the Emperor.*

9. The next year, in March, sixteen Lutheran Princes assembled at Naumburg and resolved: "That as to religion they would not exceed the terms and limits of the Augsburg Confession; but because those heads of the Christian religion, which were contained in it, had not in the least any seditious or impious doctrines, by the blessing of God they would persevere in it." They also insisted on the execution of the Article in the Passau Treaty, which provides "that those of the Augsburg Confession shall also be admitted into the Imperial Chamber." †

7. *The Augsburg Religious Peace.*

We come now to the year 1555. In the twenty-five years that stretch back to the first Diet of Augsburg the Lutheran Church had passed through trying vicissitudes. It had suffered the loss of Luther, had experienced the desolations of the Schmalkaldic War, had been distracted by the two *interims,* had been racked by internal feuds, had been wounded and weakened by the political animosities of the Weimar Dukes and the Elector of Saxony. Yet, with all, and notwithstanding all, in this first quarter century of its existence it had so lengthened its cords and strengthened its stakes that by the year 1555 Protestantism embraced nine-tenths of the peoples of Germany and twenty-nine-thirtieths of the population of the Archduchy of Austria. Or, more particularly: In Germany the Lutherans composed seven-tenths of the population; the sects, two-tenths; the Roman Catholics, one-tenth.‡

But here at Augsburg, in 1555, the Lutheran Church failed to secure the full fruition of her victory. The Lutheran, or so-called Lutheran, Princes of Germany had become religiously degenerate. They were not animated by the spirit that had animated their fathers at Augsburg in 1530, and they did not have

* C. R. VIII., 284; Salig, I., 682-3.

† Sleidan, p. 431*b*; Eng. Translation, p. 572; *Ibid.*, p. 614. Von Ranke, 5: 263. Möller-Kawerau, 2d Ed., III., p. 147. Lindsay, II., 396.

‡ Von Ranke, *The Popes,* Eng. Tr., I., p. 195. Kahnis *Der Innere Gang des Deutschen Protestantismus,* p. 61. *Realencyclopädie,*[3] II., p. 253; *Ibid.,* XIV., p. 322. *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte,* X., p. 221.

chancellors like Brück, Heller, Feige. The Macchiavellian political spirit ruled in the hearts of the Princes assembled at this second Diet of Augsburg. Joachim of Brandenburg, still quite as much Catholic as Lutheran, had instructed his commissioners to declare the Imperial Interim as the proper basis for the meeting of Catholics and Lutherans, while at that very time he had his own eye directed toward his son, Sigismund, whom the Pope had already confirmed as Archbishop of Magdeburg, and was trying also to obtain the Pope's confirmation for the bishopric of Halberstadt. Many of the Protestant Princes, among them Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, still believed in the possibility of coming to an understanding with the Catholics on the subject of religion. "Evangelical Princes commended themselves or their friends to the Pope as good Catholics in order to acquire, under the maintenance of all the regulations, this or that benefice (*Stift*), while they (the Catholics) at the same time promised to the Evangelicals in these benefices (*Stiftern*) the exercise of the true religion. Even the Elector August of Saxony during the Diet played such a comedy with reference to the bishopric of Meissen. In strongest antithesis to this unworthy procedure stood the resolutions which had been composed at the meeting of the most distinguished Protestant Estates at Naumburg. [See above, 9.] This assembly, attended by the Elector August and the sons of the recently (March 3, 1554) deceased John Frederick, the Brandenburgers and the Hessians, altogether sixteen Princes and thirty magnates, presented a kind of counter-Diet, except that it exhibited more splendor than the Imperial Diet. Here, indeed, the final attitude of the Evangelicals was consistent. It was resolved (March 12th) to stand by the Augsburg Confession of 1530 and to decline the settlement of religious questions by a vote of the majority. The Elector Joachim hastened to abandon his unfortunate proposition in regard to the Interim. Thus, on the side of the Protestants, a firm foundation was gained for the negotiations at Augsburg. Meanwhile the Electoral College at Augsburg had decided, first of all, to take up the burning question, and that, too, at any cost, in the sense of an abiding peace; whereupon the College of Princes violently resisted and the Cardinal of Augsburg protested in every way. But the decided declaration of the Naumburg Princes made a greater impression than did this protest, while at the Diet Christopher of Würtemberg, in opposition to the Catholic majority of the College of Princes, 'as the ringleader of the

party,' advocated the demands of the Evangelicals. Finally it came about that all the spiritual Princes even, with the exception of the Cardinal, agreed on a permanent religious peace without a preceding consensus, and, in view of the threatening attitude of the Evangelicals, they withdrew some provisos which they had made. It was agreed that the peace should be 'firm, constant, unconditional and everlasting.' Even the conditions of such a peace, absolutely indispensable for the Protestants: Guarantee of the right of possession and of church government, were carried through without any special difficulty. The episcopal jurisdiction with reference to the Protestant territories was suspended, the confiscation of the spiritual goods, in so far as they did not belong immediately to the Empire and were in the hands of the Protestants at the time of the Passau Treaty, was sanctioned." *

That is, here at Augsburg, September 25, 1555, the Lutherans, notwithstanding the double-dealing of some of the most powerful Protestant, or so-called Protestant, Princes, wrung from the Catholics the Decree of absolute religious independence in the sense and to the extent that neither the Emperor, nor the King of the Romans, nor any Prince or Estate of the Empire, for any cause or pretext whatever, shall attack or injure the adherents of the Augsburg Confession on account of their religious faith; nor shall they by command, nor in any other way, force any adherent of the Augsburg Confession to forsake his religion, or to abandon the ceremonies already instituted or hereafter to be instituted; and the Emperor and the King and the Estates shall suffer them without hindrance to profess the religion of the Augsburg Confession, and peacefully to enjoy their goods, possessions, rents and rights.†

The Catholics insisted on naming in the Recess the Augsburg Confession of 1530, or, the form in which it had been delivered to the Emperor, and in confining the benefits of the peace to those who adhered to the Confession in that form. They charged that the Protestants were not agreed among themselves, inasmuch as the later editions of the Confession contradicted the earlier. But the Electoral Counsellors would not limit themselves to any one redaction of the Confession, since the later editions did not differ from that of 1530, and at Passau all

* Von Bezold, *Geschichte der Deutschen Reformation*, pp. 867-8.

† Text in Salig, I., 690 *et seqq.* See Sleidan, Lib. XXVI. Gieseler, IV., 207. Lindsay, I., 397. K. Th. Hergang, *Das Augsburger Interim*, pp. 272-276.

"others who do not belong to the known sects condemned by the Imperial Recess" were to be admitted into the peace. That is, the scope of the peace as determined by the Protestants themselves excluded only Zwinglians, Anabaptists, etc.* And as regards the Augsburg Confession, the "Invariata" and the "Variata" were placed on the same level.† And as the text of this Imperial Recess has not been officially changed, it is exactly on this basis that the Protestants of Germany vindicate their religious rights to this day. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) harks back to the Religious Peace of Augsburg and makes no mention of the different editions of the Augsburg Confession.‡ "And it is evident, at least in regard to the commissioners of Electoral Saxony, that they meant actually to include the Upper German adherents of the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper among those who were to be protected by the law."§ And the reason given by the Saxon commissioners for this broader conception is that they were not constructing articles of faith, but concluding a common peace, and that they did not wish to arouse further distrust.||

Nevertheless, this decree of absolute religious independence in favor of all adherents of the Augsburg Confession was coupled with the pernicious principle of the *cujus regio ejus religio*, that is, the religion of the civil ruler determines the religion of his subjects; so that, should inclination or interest lead a civil ruler to remain a Catholic, or to become a Catholic, the people living in his dominions should be Catholics, though a subject professing a different religion from his Prince might depart the country without molestation.

This enactment opened a wider door to the Jesuits, and quickened their energies in entering the houses of Princes and in insinuating themselves as the tutors and instructors of the future rulers of the different territories. From this time on the counter-Reformation made rapid progress, and the Jesuits and the German Catholic Princes became the strongest and the most aggressive supporters of Rome.¶ Inquisitions were begun, as in Ba-

* The language of the excluding article is as follows: "Doch sollen alle andere/ so obgemeldten beyden Religionen nit anhängig/ in disem Frieden nit gemeynt/ sonder gänzlich aussgeschlossen seyn."

† Von Ranke, 5, 262; 6, p. 305 *et seqq.;* Karl Müller, *Kirchengeschichte,* II., 448; *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte,* X. Band, 225; G. Wolf, *Der Augsburger Religionsfriede,* p. 61; *Realencyclopädie,*[3] II., 252.

‡ Friedberg, *Kirchenrecht,* Anhang, III., 320.

§ Ludwig Schwabe in *Neues Archiv, ut supra,* p. 226.

|| Von Ranke, 6, 308.

¶ Gieseler, *Church History,* IV., 223 *et seqq.*

varia, and colleges were established for training the most subservient agents for all kinds of service in opposition to the Reformation, so that in the course of time, instead of having one-tenth of the people of Germany, the Roman Catholic Church now has more than one-third of the people of Germany and nearly all the people of Austria.

But besides the *cujus regio ejus religio,* the Diet embodied in the *Recess* the famous *Ecclesiastical Reservation,* which provided that a Bishop, Prelate or other Catholic clergyman leaving the Catholic Church, should forfeit all the revenues attached to his station; and the Chapter, or those who by law or custom had the right of choosing a successor, could proceed to fill the vacancy by electing one of the old faith, and could reserve to him the peaceable enjoyment of all the goods that belonged to his position. To this the Protestants objected, and they demanded as a counter-concession toleration for all Lutherans living in territories ruled over by Catholic Princes. This demand was not embodied in the Recess, but Ferdinand promised that it should be carried out in practice, which was not done.

These were the two questions which were not settled at Augsburg in 1555. As they involved fundamental principles, they, joined with the *cujus regio ejus religio,* became active among the causes that brought on *The Thirty Years' War,* so that we may say with von Bezold, that the *Augsburg Religious Peace* "was in reality an Interim which was to bring upon the nation far worse injuries and miseries than had been brought by the Reformation effected by the Emperor in 1548." * Not only did it cut off from the Lutheran Church the possibility of gaining additional territory; not only did it open wider scope to the Catholic activities; "but by it, at least as regards Lutheranism, the Reformation, which had been scarcely begun, was broken off, and was never again taken up. They (the Lutherans) thought that, because they could no longer expand themselves externally, they were also perfect internally, and were content to hold fast to the little that had been acquired. The result was doctrinal controversies and a Church of officials." † The fact is, the *personnel* of leadership among the Protestants had greatly changed. John the Steadfast, John Frederick, Margrave George, had passed away. George of Anhalt was still living, but he had never been influential. Philip of Hesse, by reason of his youth-

* *Geschichte der Deutschen Reformation,* p. 866. See Pastor, p. 476.
† Kolde in *Realencyclopädie,*[3] vol. II., p. 253.

ful excesses and in consequence of his long imprisonment, had grown prematurely old, and as a result of his bigamy he had lost his influence. The Lutheran Princes reigning at that time were, the best of them, only *epigoni*. For the most part they were such as had been influenced by Maurice, the traitor; such as were now more or less under the influence of August and of "fat old Interim," as the wits of the time nicknamed Joachim of Brandenburg, whose Macchiavellian politics have been already described. Also, as compared with their predecessors, they were indolent, selfish, jealous of each other. They had received their religion as an inheritance. It had not come to them as a conviction, and as the result of a great internal and external conflict. It was something that might be profitably employed for themselves and for their people to promote personal aggrandisement and public tranquillity. As a consequence of this lack of religious conviction and of religious discrimination, their views were too narrow and their sympathies were too contracted to provide for the world-wide interests of Protestantism. They were content to rest in present attainments, or rather, in the achievements of their predecessors. As the result of narrowness, selfishness, Macchiavellianism on the part of Protestant Princes at Augsburg in 1555, the historian must record the limitation of Protestantism throughout Europe, and the horrors of *The Thirty Years' War* in Germany. Principles may slumber, but they never die. Nevertheless, *The Augsburg Religious Peace*, even such as it was, was a great boon to Protestantism, and through Protestantism a great boon to the entire Christian world. For more than three hundred and fifty years it has stood as the *Magna Charta* for freedom of conscience in religion, and it has stimulated "the adherents of the old religion" in the direction of higher spiritual ideals. But neither Charles V. nor the Pope approved the Peace. The former, who was on the point of abdication, saw in it the defeat of his many efforts to re-unite the Church, and the Pope could not concede to an Imperial Diet the right to reform the Church.*

* In addition to the literature noted in the margins of the immediately preceding pages, see *Compositio Pacis*. "By some distinguished lawyers of the Catholic Religion," Frankfort, 1629, p. 445; Appendix, p. 46. Contains the Passau Treaty and the Augsburg Recess in the Appendix. Also: *Der Augsburger Religionsfriede*. Osnabrück, 1855, p. 59. *Der Augsburger Religionsfriede*. Leipzig, 1855, p. 140. Both of these contain the text of the Augsburg (1555) Recess.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE OTHER OLD LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS.

By the words that stand at the head of this chapter, we mean Luther's two Catechisms, the Apology of the Confession and the Schmalkald Articles, all of which were taken into the Book of Concord, published in the year 1580.

1. *Luther's Two Catechisms.*

From the latter part of July, 1516, to and including the Lenten Season in 1517, Luther preached on the Ten Commandments and on the Lord's Prayer. March 13, 1519, he wrote Spalatin: "I am engaged every evening expounding the Commandments and the Lord's Prayer to the children and to the uneducated." *

In the Lenten Season of 1522, he preached on the Ten Commandments. In the year 1523 he preached on "the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ave Maria." † In the years 1523, '24, '25, '26, '27, '28, he preached on the Sacrament and on Confession. In the years 1526, '27, '28, he preached on different points connected with Baptism. In 1527 he preached a series of sermons on the Ten Commandments.‡

Much of the material in these sermons is catechetical, and the end kept in view, in many instances, was to prepare the simple people for the worthy reception of the Lord's Supper. Some of his publications in these years bear the following titles: "An Explanation of the Lord's Prayer for the Plain Laity" (1518); "A Short Explanation as to how one should Confess" (1519); "A Short Form of the Ten Commandments, of the Creed and of the Lord's Prayer" (1520). Of this last, Dr. Inmischer, the editor of Luther's Homiletical and Catechetical Writings for the Erlangen Edition, says: "These three parts: Of the Ten Commandments, Of the Creed, and Of the Lord's Prayer, held an important place during the Middle Ages up to the times of the Reformation, as the foundation of popu-

* De Wette, I., 239.
† Buchwald, *Die Entstehung der Catechismen Luthers.* V.
‡ Erl. Ed., 36: 1-144. Buchwald, p. viii. *a*, note 1.

lar instruction in the Church, and Luther esteemed them so highly that he declared that in these three parts is contained, fundamentally and abundantly, all that exists in the Holy Scriptures, that is preached and that is necessary for the Christian to know. Hence, he not only explained them in the present writing, but made them the basis of his Small Catechism of 1529."*

In the introduction to this *Short Form,* Luther complains of the existence of many books of high-sounding title—*Hortulus Animae, Paradisum Animae*—by which Christians are deceived. He also condemns the Passionary and the Legend Book as containing contributions from the devil. He shows how the Commandments are kept and how they are transgressed. He expounds the Creed under three general heads and makes a most frequent use of "I believe." Then, after a brief introduction, he explains the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer, with a fair degree of fulness. It has been well said that this little book is the most important forerunner of the Catechisms.

In *The German Mass and Order of Divine Service* (1526),† Luther wrote: "Well, in God's name! The first thing, a good, simple, plain, easy catechism is necessary in German worship. But catechism means the instruction with which the heathen, who wished to become Christians, were taught and directed what they should believe, do, abstain from, and know in Christianity; hence the learners, who were received for such instruction and learned the faith before they were baptized, were called catechumens. The instruction or teaching I do not know how to arrange more simply or better than it has been arranged from the beginning of Christianity, and continued up to the present time; namely, the three parts: The Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. In these three parts is found simply and briefly almost all that a Christian needs to know." He then proceeds to say that Christian instruction must be preached from the pulpit, and that the children and servants must be questioned from article to article, and he actually shows how it is to be done, by propounding and answering questions on the Lord's Prayer and on the Creed.

But it was the Visitation of the Saxon churches in 1527-9, that gave the real occasion for the composition of the Catechisms in the form in which we now know them, for in the Preface to the Small Catechism, Luther writes as follows: "The deplor-

* Erl. Ed., 22: 1.

† Erl. Ed., 22: 226 *et seqq.*

able destitution which I observed, during a visitation of the churches, has impelled and constrained me to prepare this Catechism or Christian Doctrine in such a small and simple form. Alas, what manifold misery I beheld! The common people, especially in the villages, know nothing at all of Christian doctrine; and many pastors are quite unfit and incompetent to teach. Yet all are Christians, have been baptized, and enjoy the use of the sacraments, although they know neither the Lord's Prayer, nor the Creed, nor the Ten Commandments, and live like the poor brutes and swine. Still they have, now that the Gospel has come, learned to abuse all liberty in a masterly manner."

It was also, doubtless, the discovery of this deplorable destitution that led Luther to preach, in the year 1528, three courses of catechetical sermons at Wittenberg, one in May, one in September and one in December. But by this time he was ready to begin the work of writing the Catechisms, or rather of changing these sermons into catechisms.*

January 15, 1529, we find him at work on the Catechism, for on that day he writes to Pastor Martin Görlitz of Brunswick: "I am now engaged in preparing a Catechism for the rude pagans." † And on January 20th, George Rörer writes to Stephen Roth: "I think at the time of the next Frankfort Fair the Catechism preached by D. M. will be published for the rude and simple." ‡ This was the Large Catechism, which was finished and published on or before April 23d, for on that day Rörer sent three copies of the printed Catechism to Zwickau.§

The Large Catechism was now complete in its first form. It bore the simple title: *German Catechism, Mart. Luther.* A second edition appeared the same year with the addition of *A Brief Admonition to Confession.* A third edition appeared in the year 1530, to which Luther prefixed the large preface emphasizing the value of catechetical instruction, and giving second place to the shorter preface which had appeared with the earlier edition.|| According to the shorter preface Luther "prepared this little book with no other view than to adapt it to the instruction of the young and illiterate," but in the longer pref-

* *Realencyclopädie,*[3] X., p. 132.
† Ender's *Luther's Briefwechsel,* 7: 43 and note 6.
‡ *Wittenberg Stadt-u. Univ.-Geschichte,* p. 51.
§ *Ut supra,* p. 59. Buchwald, *ut supra,* p. xvi. b.
|| Kolde, *Einleitung,* pp. lix., lx.

ace he urges "pastors and preachers to exercise themselves and others assiduously every day in the Catechism, as a synopsis and comprehensive epitome of the whole Sacred Scripture, faithfully and continually proclaiming it to the Church."

But while Luther was engaged in the preparation of the Large Catechism, he prepared and published an epitome of it, that is, the Small Catechism, though not in book form, but in the form of two series of tables, or tablets, which, as intended chiefly for use in the family and in schools, could be hung against the wall. This is evident from a passage in the letter written, January 20th, by George Rörer to Stephen Roth: "While I am writing this I look at the wall of my aestuary.* I see hanging on the wall tablets (tabulas) containing in very brief and compact form Luther's Catechism for children and for the family." †

The first series, that to which Rörer refers, appeared not later than January 20th, and contained the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and other prayers. The second series appeared before the middle of March, or about the time that the people were accustomed to go to Confession and to Communion. This we learn from a letter written by Rörer, March 16th, to Roth, in which he says that it has been recently printed, and he calls it "tablets (tabulae) of Confession and tables on the sacraments of Baptism and of the Body and Blood of Christ." ‡ By May 16th, the Small Catechism had appeared in book form, and very soon thereafter a second edition was printed. Neither of these editions is now extant. But we have reprints of the first Wittenberg edition, two of them done in Erfurt, and one in Marburg.§ These reprints, made independently of each other, show us to a high degree of certainty what the original Wittenberg edition was. Turning now to one of the Erfurt reprints, and to the Marburg reprint, we find that they contain the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Sacrament of Holy Baptism and the Sacrament of the Altar, that is, the five principal parts. These are followed by the Morning and Evening Prayers, The Benedicite and

* Aestuarium: Defined in Du Cange by *Hypocaustum*, Gall. *Poële, Etuve*, Stove.

† Buchwald, *Arch. für Gesch. d. dtsch. Buchh.*, XVI., p. 84.

‡ *Realencyclopädie*, X., p. 133. Tabulae is defined as *writing tablets*, and as *tablets written upon.*

§ By Theodosius Harnack, in his *Der Kleine Katechismus*, Stuttgart, 1856. The other Erfurt reprint has been reproduced in fac-simile by Hartung in Leipzig. This we have not seen.

Gratias, The Table of Duties *(Haustafel)*, The Marriage Ceremony for Plain Pastors (*Ein Trawbuchlin*). Harnack reproduces one of the Erfurt editions as a reprint of the *editio princeps*, with textual variants of the Marburg reprint in the margin.

By June 13, 1529, a third edition of the Small Catechism had appeared at Wittenberg, which, in addition to the five chief parts, contains the following as an appendix (Anhang): *Morning and Evening Prayers, The Benedicite and Gratias, The Table of Duties* (Haustafel), *A Marriage Ceremony for Plain Pastors* (Ein Trawbuchlin,) *The Order for Infant Baptism* (Das Tauffbuchlin verdeudschet, und auffs neu zugericht, durch *Mart. Luther)* of 1526, *The German Litany*, with notes and three closing collects.*

Now placing side by side the title-pages of the Erfurt and Marburg reprints, and that of the third Wittenberg edition, we have the following interesting exhibit:

		ENCHIRIDION.
Der kleine Catechismus fur die gemeine Pfarherr vnd Prediger.	Der Kleine Catechismus, Für die gemeyne Pfarherr vnd Prediger.	Der kleine Catechismus für die gemeine Pfarher vnd Prediger, Gemehret vnd gebessert, durch
Mart. Luther. Wittemberg.	Mart. Luther Marburg. 1529.	Mart. Luther. Wittemberg.
—	—	—
At the end: Gedruckt zu Erffurd durch Conrad Treffer.	At the end: Gedruckt zu Marburg ym Jahr M.D. vnd XXIX.	At the end: Gedruckt zu Wittemberg, durch Nickel Schirlentz. M. D. XXIX.

These title-pages all show that the Small Catechism was intended for the use of pastors and preachers, whether for their own personal instruction and spiritual benefit, or for use in their congregations, or for both uses, is not indicated; but more probably, as indicated by the Preface, it was intended, in this book form, both to be studied by the pastors and to be taught to the people in order to prepare them for a worthy approach to the sacrament and for discharging the duties of Christians.

* *Erl. Ed.*, 21, p. 3; 22; pp. 290 *et seqq.* Harnack, pp. xxii., xxiii., 72, 82, 83. Kolde, *Einleitung*, pp. lx., lxi. Buchwald, *Entstehung*, p. xiv. *Realencyclopädie*,[3] X., p. 134.

It is particularly to be noted that the third Wittenberg edition was "enlarged and improved."

The Large Catechism was translated into Latin by John Lonicer, a Marburg Professor. The dedication to L. P. Rosellus of Padua, is dated May 15, 1529. The title is: Lutheri Catechismus Latina donatus civitate, per Joannem Lonicerum. Marpurgi 1529. At the end: Ex Typographia Marpurgensi, Anno Millesimo, Quingentesimo XXIX. IIII. Nonas Septembres. Meanwhile Vincentius Obsopöus, a learned school rector of Anspach, had executed a translation and had dedicated it to Margrave Albert of Brandenburg, July 1, 1529, and added to it a translation of the two Catechisms of John Brentz. The whole was published under the following title: D. Martini Lutheri Theologi, Catechismus lectu dignissimus, latinus factus per Vincentium Obsopaeum. Huic adiecti sunt alij quoque gemini Catechismi, Joannis Brentij Ecclesiastae Hallensis eodem interprete. Hagenoae, An. MDXXIX.*

The Small Catechism was also twice translated into Latin in the year 1529; the first time under the title: Simplicissima et brevissima Catechismi expositio, as an appendix to a translation, by an unknown hand, of Luther's little book entitled: Enchiridion piarum precationum, printed at Wittenberg in 1529. The second translation appeared with a dedication to Hermann Crotus Rubeanus, dated September 29, 1529, and was executed by John Sauermann. The title runs thus: Parvus Catechismus pro pueris in schola: Parve puer, parvum tu ne contemne libellum, continet hic summi dogmata summa Dei. Mart. Luther. M. D. XXIX. At the end: Wittenbergae apud Georgium Rhau. Anno M. D. XXIX.

Beginning with the year 1531, "original editions" of the Small Catechism appeared in the following years during the lifetime of Luther: In 1531, 1535 and 1536 (known only bibliographically); 1537, 1539, 1542.†

2. *The Apology.*

No sooner was the Catholic Confutation read, August 3d. than the Lutheran Princes requested a copy of the same that they might examine it and make good the points to which ex-

* Kolde, *Einleitung*, p. lxi. *Realencyclopädie*, X., p. 133.

† *Realencyclopädie*,[3] X., p. 134. For a more comprehensive and minute account of the genesis and history of Luther's Catechisms, consult *Erl. Ed.* of Luther's Works, vols. 21, 22; Harnack, *ut supra*; Buchwald, *ut supra*; Kolde, *ut supra*; *Realencyclopädie*,[3] Art. *Katechismen Luther's.*

ception had been taken.* The Emperor promised that he would take the matter under consideration. The next day he called a council of the Catholic Princes, who on August 5th presented him with an *Opinion*, in which he was advised that "it would be better to give the Elector and Princes a copy than to refuse it.

"But not with the intention that they make a reply to it, but that the Princes and cities may learn and understand from it the articles in which they differ from the Catholic Church, and may again unite themselves with it," but with the express declaration added that they were not to let it pass out of their hands, nor allow it to be printed.† These conditions, which Melanchthon in the Preface to the Apology calls "most perilous," the Princes were unable to accept. But feeling that they must defend their Confession they resolved to make reply to the Confutation.‡ Hence Melanchthon says: "They (the Princes) commanded me and certain others to prepare the Apology of the Confession, in which the reasons were to be presented to the Emperor why we could not accept the Confutation, and in which these first things to which the adversaries objected were to be refuted." §

But as about this same time the Reconciliation Efforts were begun, the resolution to make reply to the Confutation was held in abeyance—was probably forgotten until after August 30th, when the Reconciliation Efforts suddenly collapsed, and when the Lutheran consciousness came to itself again. At least, it was between this time and September 20th that the Apology in its first form (*Prima Delineatio*) was written, as we learn from Melanchthon's letter of that date to Camerarius: "I am now staying at home on account of the speeches of the malevolent, and in these days I have written an apology to our Confession, which, if it shall be necessary, will be presented. It will be set over against the Confutation of the adversaries, which you heard read. I have written carefully and energetically." || And from a letter written about the same time to Egidius, one of the Emperor's chaplains: "I have not been able to reply

* Sleidan, p. 108; Eng. Tr., p. 131.

† Original in *Zeitschrift f. Kircheng.*, XII. (1891), pp. 156-8.

‡ Original in Förstemann, II., p. 180 *et seqq.*

§ It is not documentarily certain that the command was issued to Melanchthon and others *immediately* after the resolution of the Princes to make reply. But see Sleidan, p. 111, Eng. Tr. 135. C. R. XXVII., p. 247. Francke, p. xxxiv. Hase, p. lxxxvi.

|| C. R. II., 383.

with sufficient fulness to your Most Reverend Paternity, for we have been occupied in preparing an apology to be delivered to the Emperor. It will be somewhat severer than the Confession was, if we are not able to obtain justice." *

These two letters make it fairly certain that the Apology was completed by September 20th, and that it had been in course of preparation for some time—perhaps from about the first of September. The data in hand will not allow us to determine the chronology more accurately.

As Melanchthon had not heard the Confutation read, and as he could not obtain a copy of it, he had to depend on the notes made by Camerarius and others for his materials.† Perhaps he had also learned from some of the Catholics, who served on the Reconciliation Committees, the points raised in objection to the Confession. Inadequate as these materials were, Melanchthon and his associates were enabled to reply with a fair degree of fulness and success to the Confutation. But under what circumstances the Princes approved the Apology in this, its first form, or whether they took any formal action in regard to it, has not been reported. We know, however, when, September 22d, the preliminary Recess of the Diet was read and the declaration was made in it, that the Lutheran Confession, on "the good foundation of the Holy Gospels and of writings, had been refuted and rejected," ‡ Chancellor Brück took occasion to hand the Apology, prepared both in Latin and in German, to Frederick Count Palatine, the Emperor's spokesman, who reached it toward the Emperor, who was in the act of receiving it when his brother, Ferdinand, whispered in his ear; whereupon he waved it from his presence, and Count Frederick returned it to Brück.§ The Apology of the Augsburg Confession was thus offered to the Emperor, but was rejected by him.

This *prima delineatio* of the Apology has no confessional significance. It was published in the Latin text by Chytraeus in his *Historia* of the Augsburg Confession, 1578, and more accurately by Förstemann in 1835, and the Latin and German

* C. R. II., 381. In this letter to Egidius, Melanchthon defends himself against the accusation that by his haughtiness and stubborness he had irritated the Catholic Princes. He says that he desired peace for "no reason except that he saw that if peace should not be established it would come to pass that ours would be united with the Zwinglians."

† See C. R. XXVII., 227 *et seqq.*

‡ Förstemann, II., 475.

§ Salig, I., 340. Spalatin, *Annales*, p. 197. Sleidan, p. 111; Eng. Tr., p. 135. Köllner, *Symbolik*, I., 421.

texts are both given by Bindseil in Vol. XXVII. of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, pp. 275 *et seqq.*

The next day, September 23d, the Elector of Saxony, and some other Princes, with their suites, left Augsburg and turned their faces homeward. The defense of their Confession had been rejected. The Recess finally gave them till April 15th of the following year to acquiesce in the doctrines of the Pope, which the Emperor himself and all the rest of the Christian world professed. A copy of the Recess had been refused them, and the Emperor had become impatient with their appeals to their Confession and to their consciences.* Further negotiations could have accomplished nothing. Indeed the minds of the Lutheran Princes had become irritated by the unfairness shown by the Emperor and the Catholic Princes, and they were resolved now more than ever to stand by their Confession. Melanchthon especially was quickened in the defense of the Confession. In Spalatin's house at Altenburg, he wrought at it on Sunday until Luther took the pen out of his hand and told him that on that day he should not engage in such work.† Soon after reaching Wittenberg he received a copy of the Confutation that had been made, probably by a son of Jerome Ebner, who, with his brother, had made the recension of the Augsburg Confession that had been sent to Nürnberg, June 3d, and who stood in close relation with Melanchthon at Augsburg.‡

When now he read the Confutation he became more than ever excited, when he saw "how insiduously it had been written, so that in some places it might deceive even the cautious," as he afterwards declares in the Preface. During the Autumn of 1530 and the Winter that followed, he seems to have labored assiduously on it; and it seems to have cost him more time and toil than he had expected at the beginning. November 11th he wrote to Veit Dietrich: "I will transcribe (the Greek Masses) for Osiander when I shall have finished the Apology, which I am now revising and trying to put in shape. I will there explain all the principal controversies. I hope this will be useful."§ On November 13th he wrote to Camerarius: "I am wholly engaged in revising the *Apology*. I will elaborate it carefully, so far as shall seem proper. I will include in it our controversies, and expound them all. This, as I hope, will be profitable."|| In February he wrote to Brentz: "I am re-

* Sleidan, p. 111; Eng. Tr., 135-6.
† Salig, I., 375.
‡ Kolde, *Einleitung*, p. xxxvii.
§ C. R. II., 438.
|| C. R. II., 440.

vising the Apology. It will appear much enlarged and better fortified. At the present time the article by which we teach that men are justified by faith, not by love, is being copiously treated, because on account of the propitiation of Christ it is necessary to understand that we are justified by faith, and that justification by love is justification according to the law and not according to the Gospel. The Gospel sets forth one kind of righteousness, the law another kind. When I shall have finished it I will send it."* Early in March he wrote to Hieronymus Baumgartner: "I have not yet finished the *Apology*. I am impeded not only by poor health, but also by many other engagements."† And on March 7th again to Camerarius: "My *Apology* is not yet completed. The work grows while I am writing."‡ March 17th he wrote to Camerarius: "My Apology proceeds more tardily than it ought."§ And a little later to Baumgartner: "The Apology is still in press, for the whole of it is being revised and will be amplified by me,"|| April 8th to Brentz again: "I have almost completed the Apology."¶ April 11th to Camerarius: "My Apology is now being published. I will see that you get it."** About the middle of April he wrote to Bucer: "My Apology is published. In it I think I have treated the articles on justification, on repentance (penitence), and some others, in such a way that the opponents will understand that the burden is placed upon them."††

From these and from other letters that might be quoted, we are informed of the progress made by Melanchthon in writing and in publishing the Apology. He was especially solicitous about the article of justification. While the work was passing through the press he actually took out some five and a half or six printed sheets on which he had discussed that subject, and replaced them by an entirely new treatment of the subject, in which he sets forth especially the essential nature of justification and the relation of faith and good work.‡‡

But while Melanchthon was writing the Apology he was also revising and editing the Augsburg Confession. Both appeared together in print during the latter half of April or early in May, 1531, in what is known as the Latin *editio princeps*. Some time later in the same year, appeared the German *editio*

* C. R. II., 484.
† C. R. II., 485.
‡ C. R. II., 486.
§ C. R. II., 488.
|| C. R. II., 492.
¶ C. R. II., 494.
** C. R. II., 495.
†† C. R. II., 498.
‡‡ C. R. XXVII., 385, 460 *et seqq.* Kolde, *Einleitung*, p. xxxviii. Müller, *Einleitung*, p. lxxxiv.

princeps of the Confession, accompanied by the German *editio princeps* of the Apology. The German translation of the Apology is credited to Justus Jonas on the title-page, though he was to such an extent assisted by Melanchthon, who made so many additions, omissions and alterations in the text, that this German *editio princeps* of the Apology has an independent significance. Hence the *Apology in German* must also be regarded as a work of Melanchthon's, and as containing his teaching on the subjects discussed.*

In the Autumn of 1531, Melanchthon published a revised edition of the Latin Apology and had it accompany the second (octavo) Latin edition of the Confession. In this revised edition he made some important changes. For instance, the citations in Article X., in which he quotes from the Greek Canon of the Mass, and from Theophilact of Bulgaria, are omitted, and nothing is put in their places.† These citations are also omitted from the German edition. It is probable that they had given offense, as they have often since done, and were omitted to avoid the imputation of transubstantiation that is implied, especially in the words: *"Vere in carnem mutari."* In subsequent editions no important changes were made either in the Latin or in the German text, though there are a good many various readings.‡

The Apology in its first form was an official writing, and had been prepared under command. But it appears now, in 1531, under the name of Melanchthon, who in the Preface tells the reader why it was written, and why he attaches his name to it. But at once it received recognition. Brentz prized it so highly that he thought it worthy of canonization.§ At Schweinfurt, in 1532, it was placed along side the Confession as a symbolical book.|| On the 19th of November the Archbishop of Mayence sent a copy to the Emperor in order to show him how the Christian religion was being brought to destruction. Cochlaeus

* Müller's *Einleitung in die Symb. Bücher,* p. lxxxviii. Kolde, *Einleitung,* p. xxxix. For the probable date of the publication of the German Apology, see Kolde, *ut supra,* text and note.

† The citations omitted are as follows: In quo (Canone) aperte orat sacerdos, ut mutato pane ipsum corpus Christi fiat. Et Vulgarius, scriptor ut nobis videtur non stultus, diserte inquit, *panem non tantum figuram esse, sed vere in carnem mutari.* Müller, p. 164.

‡ See Kolde, *Einleitung,* p. xli. Hase, lxxxviii. *et seqq.* C. R. XXVII., 422 *et seqq.*, 376-7.

§ C. R. II., 512.

|| Winckelmann, *Der Schmalkaldische Bund,* p. 305. Plitt, *Apologie der Augustana,* 246 *et seqq.*

reports that many at Rome were pleased with it, and that he himself had been asked to write against it.*

The Apology, looked at in itself and considered with reference to its influence, must be regarded, next to the Confession, as Melanchthon's greatest achievement. No other work, except the Confession, gave him so much anxiety as did the Apology. For more than six months he was engaged at it almost to the exclusion of everything else. We do not wonder, therefore, that it ranks as the most learned of the Lutheran symbols. But the learning that it exhibits is not pedantry. The author's skill in the Scriptures and his profound acquaintance with the teaching of the early Church were employed to amplify, to illustrate, to vindicate, and to express, with a revived Lutheran consciousness, the doctrines which he had stated, all too mildly, in the Confession as it had been read and delivered to the Emperor. Hence the tone of the Apology, while dignified and respectful, is also polemical and aggressive. And yet upon the whole it is so practical, that it may be profitably read as a book of devotion. Its occasional errors in exegesis and in patristic quotations are due to the age in which it was written rather than to the man who wrote it—an age in which the science of exegesis and the study of the Fathers were in their infancy.† But notwithstanding the deficiencies of the Apology in secondary matters, and its objectionable features in a few points,‡ it has always ranked as a theological treatise of great value, and will always be highly esteemed, as it has been hitherto, because it is the first and the most authoritative interpretation of the Augsburg Confession.

If now we turn to the contents of the Apology, we may say with the Estates § at Schweinfurt in 1532, that it is the correlate of the Confession, for in general it follows the Confession throughout, article by article, and defends and expounds the articles as they have need and also with reference to the Confutation, which had approved some articles and had rejected others. Articles I. and III. are treated very briefly, because both these articles are approved in the Confutation. In Article III. original sin is declared to be an "active hereditary con-

* Kolde, *Einleitung*, p. xl.; *Zeitschrift f. Kircheng.*, vol. XVII. (1898), p. 236; Müller, *Einleitung*, p. lxxxiii.-v.; Salig, I., 376-7.

† Müller, *Einleitung*, p. lxxxv.

‡ We refer more particularly to the citations from the Greek Canon of the Mass and from Theophilact, noted above, and to the declaration that Absolution is truly a sacrament. *De Usu et Numero Sacramentorum.*

§ Winckelmann, p. 305.

tagion by which our whole nature is corrupted, by which we inherit such hearts, minds and thoughts from Adam, as are immediately opposed to God and to his first and greatest commandment.'' Article IV. teaches that men are justified before God by faith alone, and faith is defined as a firm confidence of heart and reliance on the promises of God. ''The Creed says: 'I believe the remission of sin.' '' Articles V. and VI., on the Means of Grace and on the Fruits of Faith, are passed over in silence, since he had discussed these subjects in the preceding article. Articles VII. and VIII. are taken together, because they belong together. The Church is not only an organization having external rites and ceremonies, ''but it is fundamentally a society possessing faith and the Holy Spirit in hearts,'' though there are wicked men and hypocrites in the Church. The Creed commands to believe ''that there is a Holy Catholic Church. But the wicked are not the Holy Church.'' In Article IX. it is declared that ''Baptism is necessary to salvation,'' and that ''as salvation is offered to all, so Baptism is offered to all, to men, women and children.'' Article X. declares that ''in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly administered (exhibeantur) with those things which are seen,* with the bread and wine, to those who receive the sacrament.'' By Article XI. Absolution is retained, but it is declared ''that the enumeration of sins is not necessary according to the divine law.'' Article XII. rejects the papal doctrine of merits and satisfactions, and teaches that those who fall into sin after Baptism can obtain pardon when they repent of their sins and truly believe on Christ. According to Article XIII., ''sacraments are rites, which have the command of God, and to which is added a promise of grace.'' ''Therefore Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Absolution, which is the sacrament of repentance (poenitentiae), are truly sacraments.'' Confirmation, Extreme Unction, the Priesthood and Marriage are not sacraments. In Article XIV. it is declared that the administration of the sacraments and of the Word in the Church, must be granted to no one, unless he be properly called. Grades in the Church are of human authority. Article XV. favors good ordinances in the Church, but denies that human ordinances justify us before God or are necessary to salvation. Article XVI. denies that the Gospel abrogates civil government and domestic regula-

* The words *Quae videntur* are ambiguous and may be translated *Which seem.*

tions, "but much rather approves them, and, not only on account of punishment, but for the sake of conscience, commands to obey them as the appointments of God." Article XVII. briefly notices that the Confutation accepts this Article. Article XVIII. has for its substance that "human hearts without the Holy Spirit are without the fear of God, without confidence in God, do not believe that they are heard, that they are pardoned, that they are assisted and preserved by God. Therefore they are impious." Article XIX. briefly rehearses the statement of the corresponding article of the Confession in regard to the cause of sin. Article XX., on the relation of faith and works, has as its central thought that we are justified, that is, "acquire the remission of sins, not for the sake of our works, but by faith freely for the sake of Christ," and that "works follow the remission of sins." Article XXI., on the invocation of the saints, which article in the Confession was wholly rejected in the Confutation, denies that the saints are mediators of salvation, and denies also that there is any command or example, either in the Old or in the New Testament, that enjoins or establishes the invocation of the saints. But "the saints should be honored."

Of the seven Articles on Abuses, all of which had been rejected in the Confutation, five are defended with great vigor, viz., XXII., The Abuses with reference to both elements in the Lord's Supper; Article XXIII., The Abuses connected with the refusal of marriage to the priests; Article XXIV., The Abuses connected with the Mass; Article XXVII., The Abuses connected with Monastic Vows; Article XXVIII., The Abuses connected with Ecclesiastical Power. Article XXV., on the Abuses of Confession, and Article XXVI., on the distinction of foods, are not specifically treated, inasmuch as they had been incidentally discussed in connection with the articles, respectively, on Confession and Human Traditions.

The author closes the Apology with these significant words: "Such is the answer we at present make to the Confutation. Now we permit all pious persons to judge whether the opponents rightly boast that they have really confuted our Confession out of the Scriptures."

3. *The Schmalkald Articles.*

June 4, 1536, Pope Paul III. yielding to the demands of public sentiment and to the insistence of the Emperor, proclaimed a general council to assemble at Mantua in Italy, May

8, 1537.* Through his Nuntio, Peter Paul Vergerius, he extended an invitation to the Lutherans to be present. The proclamation of a general council excited much interest among the Lutherans. Consequently the Elector of Saxony came to Wittenberg, July 24th, and demanded an *Opinion* from his theologians and jurists as to the manner in which he should treat the summons to attend the proposed General Council. At the same time Chancellor Brück laid before the theologians and jurists four questions to be answered, the substance of which were, shall the Papal Nuncio be heard by the Elector? If heard, shall a protest be made that the Pope has proclaimed the Council on his own authority? If the Nuncio should not invite *(vociren)* the Elector of Saxony as other Princes were invited, but should cite him to appear, should a protest be made? If the Pope and the Bishops shall decide things according to their own will and pleasure, what shall be done? †

An answer to these questions was to be sent to the Elector within fourteen days. But anticipating the action of his theologians and jurists, the Elector, July 26th, with his own hand, wrote an *Opinion* on Brück's questions and sent it to the theologians and jurists, in which he counseled against heeding the invitation or citation to the proposed Diet, chiefly because acceptance of the invitation or citation would involve the recognition of the Pope, as head of the Church and of the Council.‡ August 6th Melanchthon, assisted by Luther and Jerome Schurf, prepared an *Opinion* in answer to Brück's questions and to the Elector's *Opinion,*§ in substance as follows: A distinction is to be made between citation and invitation *(vocation);* the legate should be heard so as to learn whether the Lutheran Princes had been cited, or had been invited the same as other Princes. If it appears that the Elector has been invited *(vocirt)* as other Princes, "then the Pope shows that he does yet regard these Princes (the Protestants) as heretics." Should the Protestant Princes not give the Nuncio a hearing, "the Pope and the other Estates would have cause to proceed against us as

* See Sleidan, p. 161; Eng. Tr., p. 204. We have followed the dates furnished by Virck, *Zeitschrift f. Kircheng.*, vol. XIII. 1892, p. 487, and by Kolde in *Einleitung,* p. lxii, and in the *Realencyclopädie,*[3] XVII., p. 640. The Köstlin-Kawerau *Martin Luther* gives the respective dates, June 2, 1536, and May 23, 1537; II., p. 376. The same dates in *Kirchengeschichte* (Kawerau), III., p. 132. See C. R. III., 99, 314.

† Virck, *ut supra,* p. 507.

‡ Given in C. R. III., 99 *et seqq.*

§ Köstlin-Kawerau, *Martin Luther,* II., 377, 669. Virck, *ut supra,* p. 491. *Realencyclopädie,*[3] XVII., p. 640.

contumacious." The Council will be held whether the Protestants heed the invitation or not. The Pope has the right to call a Council, but the decision belongs to the Council. It is better to attend the Council, and if affairs are not impartially conducted, the Princes can withdraw and make complaint.*

This *Opinion,* though manifestly wise and prudent, and based on the Canon Law, did not please the Elector. He did not regard the proposed Council as lawfully called, nor did he think it would be free from prejudice. Through Chancellor Brück he held a council with the Wittenberg theologians, August 30th, and had Melanchthon translate into Latin a Protest in which it was declared that should the Elector and his allies in religion accept the invitation it would be on the condition that it is to be "a free, pious, Christian and impartial Council," and that they "will approve nothing contrary to the pure doctrine of the Gospel, which they profess and which they believe is the doctrine of the Catholic Christian Church."† At the same time Luther received a commission from the Elector, in regard to which Brück could report, September 3d: "He has complied most obediently. I think he is already hard at work to show your Electoral Grace his own heart in the matter of religion, as if it were his last will." ‡

There is scarcely room for doubt that this commission has reference to the composition of articles of faith. But the matter was delayed on account of Melanchthon's absence in the Palatinate. On December 1st the Elector was again in Wittenberg deliberating with his theologians in regard to the Council.§ He demanded another *Opinion*, and to that end he left with his learned men at Wittenberg a *memorandum* in which he insisted on the rejection of the proposed Council, and in which he absolutely demanded their opinion in regard to the calling of an Evangelical Council.|| At this time also he renewed his commission to Luther to prepare articles of faith;¶ and as the matter was still delayed, on December 11th the Elector wrote Luther and instructed him to prepare articles and to submit the same to him by January 25th, following. In these articles Luther was to show "what or how much, before God, and with

* Original given in C. R. III., 119 *et seqq.*
† C. R. III., 157.
‡ Köstlin-Kawerau, *Martin Luther,* II., 378-9.
§ C. R. III., 195.
|| Virck, *ut supra,* 495 *et seqq. Realencyclopädie,*[3] XVII., p. 641.
¶ See references just given, and Köstlin-Kawerau, *Martin Luther,* II., 379.

a good conscience can be conceded or changed, out of Christian love, for the maintenance of peace and unity in the Christian Church." He was also commanded to invite Amsdorf and Agricola and other theologians to come, at the Elector's expense, to Wittenberg, and to assist in the preparation of the proposed articles; and should any of the theologians dissent from what was written, he should report to the Elector and give the reasons for his dissent.*

The composition of the articles now went forward so rapidly that by the end of December, or at the very beginning of January, Luther could lay them before Jonas, Cruciger, Bugenhagen, Amsdorf, Melanchthon, Agricola and Spalatin, who read them and discussed them, "one after the other," "and all subscribed the twenty-one chief articles of the Christian doctrine which the Reverend, Highly-learned Sir, Doctor Martin Luther, had most purely and in a Christian manner composed." †

Spalatin made a copy of the Articles (which is now in the Weimar Archives). This copy, subscribed by the theologians present, was sent, January 3d, by Luther through Spalatin to the Elector, together with a letter in which he says that the Articles were discussed several days by the theologians and subscribed by their own hands. He declares in this letter: "We have not intended to burden anybody with these Articles, but ourselves alone. We leave it free to everyone to burden himself with them or not to do so." On the 7th of January the Elector, in a letter to Luther, acknowledged the receipt of the Articles and expresses his joy that the theologians still persevere so unanimously in the Christian Articles "which you have always taught, preached and written." He declares that they are in harmony with the Augsburg Confession, and says: "After reading them through twice, we accept them as pious, Christian and correct, and will freely and publicly confess them before a council and before the whole world." He then expresses himself as opposed to Melanchthon's view in regard to the retention of the Pope, *jure humano*, that having escaped his Babylonian captivity, they will not again surrender themselves to such jeopardy.‡

* See the Elector's Letter in Burkhardt's *Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel*, pp. 271-2. *Realencyclopädie*,[3] XVII., p. 641.

† Spalatin's *Annales*, p. 307. Spalatin says that the theologians met "immediately at the beginning of the year in Weyhnachten." We may say between Christmas and January 3d. See Zangemeister, *Die Schmalkaldischen Artikel*, p. xiv.

‡ Original in Kolde's *Analecta Lutherana*, p. 285.

Two days later the Elector commissioned Chancellor Brück to lay the Articles before the chief pastors of his dominion, and to obtain their subscription to the same. "We are of the opinion," says he, "that the subscription of the pastors and preachers, should God Almighty take Dr. Martin out of the world, will serve to keep the pastors and preachers, who have subscribed, steadfast by the Articles, and will prevent their setting up doctrines and opinions of their own." *

It was the purpose of the Elector to raise these Articles to the authority of a confession of faith. Hence the Lutheran Princes and Estates were to bring with them to Schmalkald one or two theologians that "a unanimous agreement may be made." The Elector and Luther reached Schmalkald February 7th. The first session of the Convention took place on the 10th. Chancellor Brück counselled the theologians to confer with each other about doctrine, so that should they attend the Council they would know what to propose or what to concede. The next day the Estates decided "with best reasons to decline" the Saxon proposal. They gave as their principal reasons that the Council would not be held in the near future; that they had not been summoned to bring their theologians for that purpose; "also they had the confessions which had been delivered to the Emperor. In these they were united. Care should be taken to avoid schism. Should any concessions be made, this could not be conceded from the Papists. Should the Elector wish to present articles in addition to the Confession, he should submit them for inspection." The Elector and Princes also resolved that "the theologians should consider whether any concessions were to be made or whether there was anything to be disputed in the Confession, or in the Concordia, which had been recently made, but they should examine only the Confession and should change nothing pertaining to its content or substance, or to that of the Concordia, but they should strike out the Papacy, which at the Diet at Augsburg, out of regard for the Emperor, had been omitted." † And at the same time

* Original in Virck, *ut supra*, p. 512. *Realencyclopädie*,[3] XVII., pp. 641-2.

† *Aus dem Bericht der Strassburger Gesandten über den Tag von Schmalkalden*, given by Kolde in *Analecta Lutherana*, p. 296. The Concordia mentioned here is the Wittenberg Concord of 1536 (see p. 245), which at this Schmalkald convention was now endorsed by the Princes and was thus made confessional. Says Melanchthon: Ac Principes diserte testati sunt, se formulam concordiae conservaturos esse. C. R. III., 292. And Köstlin-Kawerau: "The Princes also declare that they wish to maintain the Concordia." *Martin Luther*, II., 394. Veit Dietrich reports that when everything was done. Bugenhagen called the theologians together again and

they instructed their theologians to examine the Confession and the Apology, and to fortify them with new arguments drawn from the Scriptures, from the Fathers, from the councils and from the decrees of the Popes.*

Melanchthon was instructed to write articles on the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff and on the Power and Jurisdiction of the Bishops.† These he finished February 17th.‡ Both articles were presented to the Princes, and both were signed by thirty-five theologians and pastors,§ among whom was Martin Bucer, who, in a colloquy on the Lord's Supper, "affirmed the presence of Christ and satisfied all, even those who are rather hard to please." ||

This *Tractate on the Power and Primacy of the Pope* and on *The Power and Jurisdiction of the Bishops*, was the only confessional document promulgated by the Schmalkald Convention.¶ It was regarded by the theologians as in harmony with the Confession and Apology, and has been treated as an appendix to the Schmalkald Articles and has been published with these articles in Luther's works and in the Lutheran Symbolical Books.

Luther's Articles, which, as we have learned, were not accepted by the Lutheran Princes assembled at Schmalkald, were published in 1538 by their author, with a long Preface and with many changes, under the title: *Articuli, So da hälten sollen aufs Concilium zu Mantua, oder wo es würde sein, überantwortet werden;*** that is, *Articles which were to have been de-*

proposed ut qui velint subscribant articulos quos Lutherus secum attulerat. In the interest of peace, the matter was dropped. Dietrich adds: "When I saw these things, it pleased me also that those articles of Luther should be omitted and that all should simply subscribe to the Confession and to the Concord. This was done without any objection." C. R. III., 372.

* C. R. III., 267. The edition of the Augsburg Confession used by the theologians at this Schmalkald Convention was the German *Variata* of 1533, which was accompanied with the Apology *mit vleis* emendirt. Weber, *Geschichte*, II., 59 *et seqq.*; C. R. XXVI., 699. The article on the Lord's Supper in the Schmalkald Articles was *originally* composed by Luther in the wording of the Wittenberg Concord, but was changed at the instance of Bugenhagen to its present wording. Kawerau, III., p. 133. Also Hausleiter, *Luther's Leben*, II., 370.

† C. R. III., 292.

‡ C. R. III., 267.

§ C. R. III., 286-7.

|| C. R. III., 292, 371.

¶ *Realencyclopädie*,[3] XVII., 644.

** Erlangen Ed. (first), 25, p. 109; (second) p. 163. Luther's original manuscript as it was brought to Schmalkald in 1537 is preserved in the library of the University of Heidelberg. In 1817 it was published in types by Marheineke, with prolegomena. In 1886 it was published in *fac-simile* by Dr. Karl Zangemeister. The original is without Preface. Both

livered by our Party to the Council at Mantua, or wherever it was to be. In 1541 the Articles appeared in a Latin translation under the title Articuli a Reuerendo D. Doctore Martino Luthero scripti, Anno 1538 ut Synodo Mantuanae, quae tunc indicta erat, proponerentur, qui recens in Latinum sermonem translati sunt a Petro Generano 1541.

Turning now from the history of the Articles to their contents as the same are given in the Book of Concord, we find that in addition to the Preface they consist of three distinct parts: *"The First Part is of the High Articles of the Divine Majesty; The Second Part is of the Articles Which Concern the Office and Work of Jesus Christ or Our Redemption; The Third Part of the Articles."*

The First Part consists of four brief articles on the Trinity, in which it is said "there is no dispute nor contention about these articles." Part Second likewise contains four articles. (1) *The Chief Article* treats of Christ and of justification by faith alone. "Nothing in this article can be yielded or surrendered." (2) *Of The Mass,* "which must be the greatest and most terrible abomination." "It is not commanded of God"; "It is an unnecessary thing." "We can, according to the institution of Christ, obtain the sacrament in a far better and more acceptable way." (3) *Of Canonries and Monasteries:* "These like all other human inventions are neither commanded, nor necessary, nor useful, but dangerous and productive of vain labor and trouble." (4) *Of the Papacy:* The Pope is not *jure divino* the head of all Christendom, but only the pastor of the Church of Rome. The papacy is a human figment and has been erected by the devil. The Pope is the true antichrist, who has elevated himself above Christ. The Pope acts as the devil himself when he "urges and disseminates his falsehoods concerning Masses, purgatory, monastic life, works and services, and condemns, kills and tortures all Christians who do not prize and honor such abominations above everything."

"In these four articles they will have enough to condemn, for they cannot and will not leave us the least particle of one of these articles."

these works are in the hands of the writer, and have been used in preparing this article. In the article on the Lord's Supper, as it was originally written, it was said: Halten wir das unter brot und wein sey der warhaftige leib und blut Christi im Abendmal. The words *unter* and *im Abendmal* were subsequently stricken out at the dictation of Bugenhagen, ein heftiger man und ein grober Pommer, says Melanchthon. *Studien u. Kritiken,* 67 (1894), p. 158.

The Third Part of the Articles: "The following points or articles we may discuss with learned and reasonable men or among ourselves. The Pope and his Kingdom do not concern himself much about such, for conscience with them is nothing. It is only gold, honor and power." Then follow fifteen articles, the majority of which treat of doctrines, and the names of forty-three subscribers, some of whom also subscribed in the name of others. Melanchthon appends the following *caveat* to his subscription: "I, Philip Melanchthon, hold that the foregoing articles are true and Christian. But in regard to the Pope I hold that if he would allow the Gospel, even we, for the sake of peace and for the sake of the common unity of those Christians who are now and may hereafter be under him, might allow him, *jure humano*, the superiority over the Bishops which in some sense he has." And Dionysius Melander writes: "I subscribe to the Confession, to the Apology and to the Concord on the subject of the Eucharist."

These Schmalkald Articles are the most positive and aggressive of all the confessional statements of the Lutheran Church. They represent the mind of the author in a state of strong conviction, and in a state of intense feeling against "opponents" and "false brethren," who had turned his writings against him and had slandered the Evangelical cause in Germany. Hence they sound the tocsin of war, and set forth Luther's ultimatum, "on which he must stand and will stand till his death." The two points that are brought into the greatest prominence are: (1) The doctrine of Justification by faith alone, since "upon this Article depends all that we teach and testify against the Pope, devil and world," and (2) its attack on the Pope, who is called "true antichrist," and whose doctrine, "even in its best features, is taken from civil, imperial and pagan law."

CHAPTER XVII.

THE OLD LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS AS ECCLESIASTICAL SYMBOLS TO 1555.

By the words, *Old Lutheran Confessions,* in this chapter, we mean the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles and Luther's two Catechisms. We have seen that again and again the Princes and the theologians testified that the Confession and the Apology contained the doctrines that were held and taught among them. They maintained and insisted that the Confession, delivered at Augsburg, June 25, 1530, had not been confuted, and that the Apology, as its correlate, more fully explained the evangelical teaching. But their affirmations are couched in general terms. They do not state specifically the sense in which they understand these witnesses of their faith, nor do they take upon themselves, nor allow others to administer to them, an authoritative form of confessional obligation. The preachers say, in general, as at Schmalkald, that "they hold and teach in their churches according to the articles of the Confession and Apology." The Princes say that the Confession and Apology contain the kind of doctrine that is set forth in their churches. This doctrine they believe to be the universal teaching of the Catholic Church of Christ.

1. *General Principles.*

The Reformers enunciated principles and dropped incidental thoughts by which we are enabled to determine their attitude towards confessions as symbols of the faith. We begin with Luther. In the Preface to the Visitation Articles, which have been called the first Protestant Confession of Faith, it is declared: "We do not send this forth as a rigid command, lest we set up new papal decrees, but as a history, as a witness of our faith," and he expresses the hope that all who hold to the Gospel will thankfully accept it until God shall bring something better. In 1538 and in 1545 Luther published new editions of these Articles, still under the old Preface, adding each time a new one.* In the little work on *The Three Symbols* (1538)

* Erl. Ed., 23: 1 *et seqq.*

Luther says: "I have observed in all histories of the Universal Christian Church that all those who hold to the cardinal doctrines of Jesus Christ have remained sure and steadfast in the Christian faith, and even if they have erred and come short in other respects, they are still preserved. For whoever stands fast in this, that Jesus Christ is true God and man, that he died for us and rose again, he has and holds all Articles." * In 1541, in some reflections on propositions for union between the Protestants and the Catholics, he declares "that it is a blessing of our Confession that it tells how it went and stood formerly in our churches, as when we listen to a narration and not to a treatise or command. . . . Agreement does not depend upon ceremonies, but upon the substantials and the principal Articles" (Hauptstücke).†

Equally free was Melanchthon from all inclination to make a law out of the Confession which he composed, or to consider it a final statement of the Lutheran teaching on the articles which it embraces. We have already learned that he declared that he would have made greater changes in it had he been allowed his own way. He also inquired of Luther whether additional changes should be made in certain important parts. In the copy of the printed Confession which he sent to Luther he wrote: "*Read and correct,*" and in his numerous editions of the Confession he introduced many changes: some of which, as compared with the Confession as delivered to the Emperor, are material. At first Melanchthon called his work an *Apology,* and even after it had been delivered he called it "our defense," as by it the Lutherans designed to show what was believed and taught at that time in their churches, and to defend themselves from the calumnies of their enemies. And that at the first, and during the life-time of the reformers, the Confession was regarded in that light, the most competent Lutheran historians unhesitatingly declare.

Von Ranke, whose learning, penetration and impartiality have become almost proverbial, declares: "I do not venture to assert that the Augsburg Confession dogmatically determines the contents and import of the Scripture. It does no more than bring back the system, which had grown up in the Latin Church to a union with Scripture, or interpret Scripture in the original spirit of the Latin Church. But that spirit had wrought so imperceptibly that no one could have bound himself to any one manifestation of it. Our Confession is its purest, its most genuinely

* Erl. Ed., 23: 258. † De Wette, VI., 280.

Christian manifestation, and comes most directly from its source, It need scarcely be added that no one thought by it to set forth an abiding norm. It is only a statement of a fact: 'Our churches teach; it is taught, it is unanimously taught; ours are falsely accused.' These are the declarations employed by Melanchthon. He meant only to express the conviction that had been already developed. And in the same sense he also wrote the Second Part, in which he treated the abuses which had been abolished." * J. T. Müller, in his *Introduction to The Symbolical Books,* says: "At that time (1530-1540) this Confession and Apology were always regarded as the general Confession, and by no means as symbolical writings in our sense of that term." Matthes, in his standard work on Symbolics, says: "Naturally new confessional writings arose in both Protestant Churches (as in 1530 the Augustana and the Tetrapolitana), but it is clear from the documentary history of all these writings that originally they were to be only public *witnesses* and *defenses* of the evangelical faith, and such only did they remain for a long time. Some of them were not, indeed, composed by official authorization, and the sole one composed in the name of the entire Evangelical Lutheran party, the Augsburg Confession, was, according to its preface, delivered with the declaration: "Therefore we present and deliver the confession of our pastors and our own faith, as upon the foundation of the Holy Scripture it has been preached, taught and held in our principalities and cities. Not *only* did *Melanchthon* entertain the view that this Confession, after its delivery, might be changed and improved in particular parts, but the *Evangelical Estates* of his time thought the same. For not only did they not reject the changes already in the edition of 1531 and then in that of 1540, they even commissioned their theologians at Schmalkald, in 1537, to examine the Confession again with care, and if they found anything in it which was not in harmony with the Holy Scripture, to change it. Likewise at Naumburg, in 1561, they declared that by their subscription of the unaltered Confession (but this was already the altered of 1531) they did not mean to postpone and to reject Melanchthon's varied edition of 1540, 'because this has been repeated in a somewhat more stately and elaborate manner, also explained and enlarged on the foundation of the Holy Scripture.' And with this agrees also its position in the Augsburg Religious Peace, at which they stipulated that 'the Emperor and the Estates of the Em-

* *Deutsche Geschichte,* III., Cap. IX.

pire should oppress no Estate of the Empire on account of the religion, the faith, Church usages, ordinances and ceremonies of the Augsburg Confession, in so far as the same have been established *or may yet be established* in their principalities and dominions:' all which shows plainly that they did not see in their Confession an *unchangeable* doctrinal standard. But had *Luther,* as has been related, thought differently in regard to Melanchthon's changes and improvements, then we must remember that they did not have in the *editio princeps* the very text subscribed by the *Estates;* that Melanchthon, even in this edition, had made improvements, and that Luther had allowed himself to do the same in the publication of the Schmalkald Articles in 1538, after they had been subscribed by the theologians.'' *

Rudelbach, a rigid confessionalist, in trying to explain the reasons for the reception of the *Variata* of 1540, says: ''It must not be supposed that all the facts here presented must be judged according to a later diplomatic standard. While people lived more in the clear oral word of the Confession, rather than preyed on the written word; while they were not ashamed to receive on trust and faith that which was supposed to have sprung from a believing heart and confession; while still standing in a period of doctrinal *development,* which in many points had not yet been decided, it was not to be expected that the letters should be weighed and the syllables counted as in an epigraph.'' †

These declarations of eminent Lutheran historians are not the expressions of opinions or of predilections. They are the statement of demonstrable facts. The Reformers based their faith solely on the Word of God. They regarded their confessions as witnesses of their faith, as testimonies of their personal conviction as to the teaching of the Word of God. They were willing, indeed, to give up all their writings, if their opponents would only consent to be ruled by the writings of the Prophets and Apostles. They resisted and resented all human authority in matters of the Christian faith; and they were too conscientious to violate their own fundamental principle. It would have been glaringly inconsistent for them to renounce the tyranny of the Pope for the pleasure of asserting their own lordship over the consciences of their brethren. Even the decrees of councils and the teaching of the Fathers had no authority for them in view of

* *Comparative Symbolik aller christlichen Confessionen vom Standpunkte der evangelisch-lutherischen Confession,* pp. 12, 13. The italics are Matthes's.

† *Einleitung,* p. 107.

the one final authority, notwithstanding the fact that they always desired to be in harmony with the Primitive Church.

Luther's principle, which, *ex necessitate rei,* was the principle of the Reformation, is admirably stated by Köstlin: "In the Church the divine life exists by the operation of the Spirit and of the means of grace. Even under the Papacy there are pious persons who inwardly hold fast to the pure grace of Christ revealed in the Word. Hence the Church, illumined by the Spirit through the Word, is the infallible ground of the truth; and it is highly dangerous, yea, dreadful, to teach anything contrary to the unanimous testimony of the Universal Church. But in this temporal development it is certain that the Church also errs and sins ('else, what need of the article of the forgiveness of sins.' Erl. Ed., 25:59). Only that which is based on the Word can endure. Because of the hidden essence of the Church, and the fallibility of the ministry, nothing can be decisive to the individual in a matter of faith that is contested, so that he should confidently rest on the declarations or on the Scripture explanations of the ministry. Decisive for every believer must be the Word of Scripture, which is immediately accessible to him, and which is never doubtful; and every layman, by virtue of the Spirit which is given him, as a spiritual man, must judge all things and must be judged by none (against Erasmus, Jen. 3:177). If thus no decisive external authority is to exist, the door seems to be open to strife and sects. Luther knows that the devil wants to make tired again of the Scriptures. If now men want to build on the councils, the Father, and human decrees, the Scripture is completely lost, and they remain the devil's altogether. Only God can save and help us (Erl. Ed., 30:16-20).

"In reference to the ceremonies of worship, as the external, changeable dress of the Word and sacraments, Luther remained throughout by his original fundamental principles: He recognized the beauties of the rich old service (Erl. Ed., 64:301 f.), though it lacked exactly the chief thing, the pure Word. He paid no attention to general theories and ideals, but he joined himself to the present need, and indeed, to that of the weak, out of regard to this and also out of regard to the slanders of his enemies (Br. 4:525), he recommended a definite, uniform order; yet he saw the greatest danger always in the too great estimation of the same, in a new legalism. Hence he continued his very strong declarations against all insistence on conformity, against laying stress on externals in general, yea, against all ceremonialism

(Br. 6:379, in the year 1545: 'I confess that I am unfavorable to ceremonies even when they are necessary, but I am hostile to them when not necessary')." *

The facts and the learned opinions exhibited in the foregoing paragraphs make it perfectly clear that the Reformers did not lay stress on adherence to the letter of their confessional statements of doctrine. They concerned themselves with the substance of the revealed truth. What they were most deeply concerned about was that the Gospel be purely preached and that the sacraments be properly administered, as over against the "howl" and "the abomination of the Mass" in the Catholic Church. The center of the Gospel they found in the promise of the forgiveness of sins for the sake of Christ. This was the supreme thought, and this thought permeated the Confession and the Apology from center to circumference. For subordinate matters and for *formal* statements they had little or no concern. Hence they simply name the Confession and the Apology, and declare that they hold and teach according to the Articles contained in these writings. There is nothing like adherence to the letter. This is shown by the fact that the Elector of Saxony, in 1536, ordered new Articles for the council that was expected to be held at Mantua, and again in the *Confessio Saxonica,* which in 1551 was prepared for presentation at Trent.

But because the Augsburg Confession was both a political and an ecclesiastical document, it constantly came to the front, and the Lutherans were called adherents of the Augsburg Confession. It was made the basis of the Schmalkald League, and of the Nürnberg Religious Peace. Here it appears more particularly on its political side. In 1540-1 it was made the basis of negotiations with the Catholics at Worms and Ratisbon. Here it appears more particularly in a religious aspect. But these uses have reference to its external, rather than to its internal relations. Hence in these uses the Confession cannot be considered as a *symbol* in our sense of the word. We must turn our eyes to the internal operations of the Lutheran Church in order to see whether, and how far, and in what sense, it is used as a *symbol,* that is, as an authoritative and official statement of Christian doctrine imposed upon or voluntarily accepted by those who teach and preach in the Church.

2. *In Promotions and Ordinations.*

1. Already in the year 1530, at the command of Duke Albert,

* Herzog, *Realencyclopädie,* Art., *Luther,* pp. 611-12.

an episcopal decree was issued to the effect "that if anyone shall teach anything contrary to *the Augsburg Confession,* he shall be excommunicated, and if he does not recant, he shall be cast out of the Church absolutely."* This action determined the ecclesiastical relations of the Duchy. It had introduced an evangelical order of worship, and now it stands in doctrine relatively on the Augsburg Confession. But inasmuch as the decree does not specify the sense in which the Confession is to be received, except in a negative way, it cannot be said that it had been made a symbol of the Prussian Church. The ministry was prohibited from teaching contrary to the Confession. They were not commanded to teach its contents. But the decree undoubtedly gave the Confession high moral standing and rendered it influential in reforming the Duchy.

2. The *Saxon Visitation Articles* of 1533 ordered the officials of every parish to introduce the following books: The Latin Bible, the German Bible complete, Postils of the Time, all of Dr. Martin Luther's Postils of the Festivals, Melanchthon's *Loci Communes,* The Instruction of the Visitors, Luther's Two Catechisms, The Small Hymn Book, The Confession and Apology (German and Latin), Luther's German Psalter and Summaries.† But the ministers are not pledged to any of these books as symbols, though undoubtedly it was intended that the teaching and the preaching should express the consensus of all the books named, inasmuch as they were supposed to teach one and the same evangelical doctrine, as against the teaching of the Papacy.

3. In the Statutes of the Wittenberg Theological Faculty, written by Melanchthon in 1533, we have the following as the first article: "As in the churches of our dominion and in the juvenile schools, so in the University, in which there ought always to be distinct government and oversight in doctrine, we will that the pure doctrine of the Gospel be piously and faithfully set forth, conserved and promulgated in harmony with the Confession we delivered to the Emperor Charles at Augsburg in the year 1530, which doctrine we firmly believe to be the pure and uninterrupted consensus of the Catholic Church of God.

"Also, we do most strictly forbid the propagation and defense of the heresies that were condemned in the Nicene, the Constantinopolitan, the Ephesian and the Chalcedonic Councils. For

* *Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogthums Preussen.* Paul Tschackert, I., p. 172.

† Richter, *Kirchenordnungen,* I., 228.

to the decrees of these synods in the explanation of the doctrine of God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and of the two natures in Christ born of the Virgin Mary, we assent, and we hold that they are truly handed down in the Apostolic Scriptures. From the Confession it is sufficiently clear as to which decrees of the later councils we approve." *

The "We" who speaks in these Statutes is John Frederick, Elector of Saxony, and there can be no doubt that both he and the Wittenberg Theological Faculty believed heartily that the Confession contains the pure doctrine of the Gospel; and as little can we doubt that the Wittenberg professors taught in harmony with the Confession. But this Statute does not bind the professors to the letter of the Confession, nor state the sense in which the doctrine of the Gospel is in harmony with the Confession. To say the most, it is a very mild form of confessional obligation, as the Confession itself is the mildest possible statement of the Wittenberg teaching. And we know that the Wittenberg professors did not hesitate to make additional statements of doctrine; as the Wittenberg Concord in 1536, the Schmalkald Articles in 1537, and the Wittenberg Reformation in 1545.

4. In the year 1533 the custom was introduced at Wittenberg to require those who took theological degrees (the Promotions) "to affirm that they embrace the pure doctrine of the Gospel, and that they understand it as it is stated in the Apostles', the Nicene, and Athanasian Creed, and as it is recited in the Confession which our Churches delivered to the Emperor Charles in the Diet at Augsburg in the year 1530. And they promise that, by the help of God, they will steadfastly persevere in that view and will faithfully do their duty in the Church." Melanchthon, who reports and defends this custom, denies that its object was "to institute tyranny." He regards it a prudential measure, having for its object the protection of the Church against such as scatter dangerous errors, and as having precedents in the early Church.†

But the affirmation is general in its character. Melanchthon himself calls it a "promise." and "a repetition of the Confession." It cannot be regarded as a confessional subscription in the modern sense of that phrase. It does not characterize the Confession in its relation to the Scripture, on which the Wittenberg Reformers always laid the supreme stress. Moreover, it was so purely local that Osiander knew nothing about it until nearly twenty years after it had been inaugurated. In very words this

* Förstemann, *Liber Decanorum*, p. 152. † C. R. XII., 5 *et seqq.*

promise runs as follows: "I promise the Eternal God, Creator of the human race and Founder of his Church, his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost that by the help of God I will faithfully serve the Church with the doctrine of the Gospel, without any corruption, and that I will constantly defend the three Symbols, namely, the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian, and I will abide steadfastly in the consensus of the doctrine contained in the Augsburg Confession, which was delivered by this Church to the Emperor in the year 1530. And when dark and difficult controversies arise, I will not say anything on them alone, but will first counsel with some of the elders who instruct the Church and hold by the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession." *

The promise itself and Melanchthon's argument make it perfectly clear that this formula was not to be considered an unconditional obligation to human authority, and was not meant to make the impression on the subscriber that he must regard the Confession as an unchangeable norm of doctrine. It binds unconditionally to the Scriptures, but not unconditionally to the Creeds. It binds to the type of doctrine, not to the form of statement, as is shown by the transaction at Schmalkald in 1537, and by the *Confessio Saxonica* of 1551.

5. In the years 1537-1555 some seventeen hundred ministers were ordained at Wittenberg. For this service, at least from 1539 on, Luther's Ordination Formula, either German or Latin, was used. But neither formula contains even the shadow of a pledge to any creed or confession, nor is any pledge belonging to that time and place known to exist. But Rietschel thinks that a form similar to that employed in the promotions was employed,† but he admits that he does not know of any such formula of subscription or pledge. It may be regarded as certain, however, that in the examination that preceded the ordination, the candidate's doctrine was proved, and that none were ordained who did not understand the evangelical doctrine, and who did not give assurance that he would preach and teach it.

Of this, indeed, we have documentary evidence in certain certificates that have survived to the present time. In 1540 Luther gave a certificate to Fischer of Rudolstadt, in which it is said: "Having examined him in doctrine, we know that he holds the *pure Catholic doctrine of the Gospel*, as taught and professed by

* Salig, II., 984. Rietschel, *Luther und die Ordination*, p. 82.
† *Ut supra*, p. 83.

our Church, and he rejects all fanatical opinions which have been condemned by the judgment of the Catholic Church of Christ. He has also *promised* that he will faithfully deliver to the people the *pure doctrine* which we profess."

In harmony with this brief certificate is another much fuller and more specific, given in the year 1553 by Bugenhagen and Forster, and witnessed by Melanchthon, Hostilius and Hetzer. It reads as follows: "We, the pastor and preachers of the Church at Wittenberg, testify: The bearer of this certificate produces evidence that he has been called to the ministry at N., and that he bears a Christian character. We have been asked to examine and ordain him publicly. We have examined him carefully and find him well versed in the *pure Christian doctrine of the Gospel.* He has also promised to exercise his office with diligence and to remain steadfast in the *Christian doctrine of the Gospel* as it is confessed and taught in our churches by the grace of God in harmony with the *true Catholic Church of Christ.* Therefore is this N. N. here publicly, according to the *command of the Holy Scripture,* ordained in the Church, and is enjoined to *preach the Holy Gospel,* and to administer the holy Sacraments where he has been called. And we heartily pray that the eternal God, the Father of our Saviour Jesus Christ, will give able teachers to his Church as he has commanded us to pray and has graciously promised to give. May he also grant to this N. N. his grace and Holy Spirit that he may serve the Saviour Christ with honor and praise, and the Church unto salvation. We exhort and admonish N. N. and his Church faithfully to maintain and propagate *purity of the Christian doctrine* and to transmit it to their successors. For this service the eternal God requires of all, as Christ says in John 15: Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples. *And where this light is kept, there abides the true Church of God.* In this Church God is, and will give eternal life, and in all the troubles and anxiety of this transitory life he will give help and deliverance to those who call upon him. For *where the true doctrine of the Gospel is,* there he will be and will hear, as Christ says in John 15: If ye abide in me and my words abide in you ye shall ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you. Given at Wittenberg Anno 1553, on the day celebrated in memory of St. Luke, the writer of the evangelical history." *

This, like the other, makes no mention of the Confession. It

* Quoted with italics from Johannsen, pp. 469, 470.

obligates simply to the Gospel, as the Church at Wittenberg believed itself to hold it in harmony with the universal Church of Christ.

Such, then, was the practice at Wittenberg, where from 1537 to 1557 nearly two thousand ministers were ordained, and whence they were sent into all parts of Germany and beyond.

In the Consistorial Order of Wittenberg, or Constitution and Articles officially established by the Elector for the Wittenberg Consistory (1542), it is made the duty of the superintendents "to see that the pastors and ministers of the Gospel preach and teach in harmony and conformity with the holy Word of God, and to that end they are diligently to study the Holy Scripture in order that they may faithfully present the Christian doctrine to the people, and keep aloof from all fanatics, sects, suspicious books and doctrines." *

This Order defined the ecclesiastical practice of the three dioceses of Wittenberg, Zeitz and Zwickau. Emphasis was laid on the Word of God, but no mention is made of the Confession. In other lands the practice was the same, or essentially the same, as we learn from the *Kirchenordnungen,* which give the most perfect representations extant of all the internal and external operations of the churches of the sixteenth century. A few quotations from representative Orders, exihibiting the usage of important cities and countries, will serve to illustrate the correct custom of the age—an age of faith and of godly sincerity on the part of ministers, superintendents and theologians—an age of reformers and martyrs, who were neither afraid nor ashamed to confess the truth.

The Goslar Order, composed by Bugenhagen and Amsdorf in 1531, requires ministers to promise "to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ purely, without any additions and fanaticism," and "to confess, publicly, and hold that Zwingli, Caspar Schwenkfeld, Jacob Cantius and all their followers are heretics in the Article of the Sacrament and of the external Word and sign." †

The Brandenburg-Nürnberg Order, 1533, and the Saxon Order of 1539 were the most widely used and influential Orders of the sixteenth century. The former was composed by Osiander and Brentz, and the latter by a part of the Wittenberg Faculty and others. They insist on the preaching of the pure Word of God, and declare, the former especially, that the Bible is plain and simple; but neither mentions the Confession as a guide or di-

* Richter's *Kirchenordnungen,* I., 369. † Richter, I., p. 154.

rectory for the minister, nor in any way alludes to it. So, likewise, with the Cologne Order, composed largely by Melanchthon, and so very generally the Orders of the period embraced in this chapter. Even the Evangelical Princes assembled at Brunswick in 1538, who resolved to bind their heirs, officials and subjects to the pure Gospel, make no mention of the Confession.*

There are, however, exceptions. The Pomeranean (Bugenhagen, 1535) enjoins upon ministers the duty of preaching the Word of God, Law and Gospel; "in sum, to teach of faith, works, and the sacraments, according to the Confession and Apology presented to the Emperor at Augsburg by the Evangelical Princes." † In the Swabian Hall (Brentz, 1543) it is enjoined that "the articles about which there is at this time dispute, shall be understood, taught and preached according to the Augsburg Confession and Apology, in which they are plainly discussed on the firm basis of Holy Scripture." ‡ In the Würtemberg (1553) it is said: "We will and require that our pastors and preachers, and our other church servants shall teach and perform church acts in disputed and in other points according to the contents, directions and explanations of the two confessions mentioned" §—the Augsburg and the Würtemberg.

But in none of these cases is there subscription in our sense of the word, since it is not said how the Confession and Apology are to be interpreted, nor what relation they bear to the divine Word. Such a thing as subscription to the letter or to the words of the Confession is absolutely unknown the first quarter of a century of the existence of the Confession, and after the most thorough and protracted examination of these worthy old records we can say with Johannsen: "The most important Church Orders of the Protestant countries, in large part composed by the most distinguished Reformers themselves, lie before us, and also the use which was made of them is clear to us by the ordination certificates preserved. In all these Church Orders, which appeared before the Religious Peace (of Augsburg, 1555), there is nowhere an unconditioned binding to the Augsburg Confession or to any other symbolical book, but only the requirement that the preachers shall preach the pure Gospel of Christ according to its pure intent, and free from human opinions.

"But here the Religious Peace makes a conspicuous and distinct boundary-line. For the later Orders bind to the symbols, and

* Seckendorf, III., 174.
† Richter, I., p. 248.
‡ Richter, II., p. 15.
§ Richter, II., p. 132.

we need only to compare the later editions of these Church Orders with their original form in order to remark the essential difference. This occurs almost wherever we have been able to make the comparison. Only the Hanover Order presents an exception, for it alone, even after the Religious Peace, yea, even after the appearance of the Formula of Concord, remained unchanged as it was in 1536." *

And Rudelbach has said essentially the same thing: "The Augsburg Confession on which I here fix my gaze was only by degrees *formally* received in different countries. *Subscription* to it, and that by reason of diverse interests, occurred here earlier, there later. In some places even its reception occurred apparently only incidentally, inasmuch as an earlier national symbol existed. But the Confession, despite the imperfect reception, lived, and the faith it expressed and confessed led the steps of our confessors to the sure goal of the Reformation before it was brought into this form." †

But we have not discovered in our investigations that Luther's Catechisms and the Schmalkald Articles were elevated to the rank of symbols during the period now under review, though the Catechisms, as we have already learned, were among the books introduced by authority into every congregation during the Visitation ordered in 1533. In the Wittenberg Order of 1533 the minister or deacon is commanded to preach early on Sunday morning from the Catechism, and when he has finished it, to begin over again; and "after the sermon all the words of the Catechism shall be said." In the Saxon Order of 1539 it is enjoined that Luther's Catechism shall be used to the exclusion of every other. In the Visitation Order for Allstedt (1533) the pastor is required "to explain the Catechism, namely, the Ten Commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, according to the explanations of Doctor Martin in the Large Catechism." ‡

Thus the Catechisms early came to a high moral valuation as books of elementary instruction, and in so far as pastors were required to teach them, and to explain them in sermons, they both guided and expressed the faith of the pastors.

* *Verpflichtung*, p. 538.
† *Einleitung*, p. 188.
‡ See Sehling's *Kirchenordnungen XVI. Jahrh.* in the following places: Pp. 191; 700; 272; 508, in I. 1. for the data in the original.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE OLD LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS AS SYMBOLS FROM 1555 TO 1580.

THE Augsburg Religious Peace of 1555 marks a turning point in the history of confessional subscription in the Lutheran Church. Prior to that event the subject had received very little attention. The Lutheran Church was in a condition of doctrinal development and of revolt from human authority. Even the Princes who had subscribed the Augsburg Confession as containing and exhibiting the doctrine and faith of their churches and their own faith, gave their theologians instruction to examine the Confession again in the light of the Scriptures, and to change it, in case they found in it anything not in harmony with the one only Infallible Rule of Faith. The occasional obligation of men to the Confession and to the Apology arose from diverse considerations and from accident—not from a deliberate and united purpose to bind men to those documents as *symbols* of the Lutheran faith.

But it began to be different after 1555.* The benefits of the Religious Peace could be enjoyed by individuals, churches, cities and principalities only in so far as they proclaimed themselves adherents of the Augsburg Confession. The Catholics, especially the Jesuits, who had insisted on confining the Lutherans to the Confession as it had been delivered in 1530, were quick to magnify every departure, seeming or real, from the Confession in that form, and were constantly representing to the Emperor that the Lutherans were violating the terms of the Augsburg Peace. But despite the misrepresentations of their enemies, the Lutherans had succeeded in having the terms of the Peace confirmed at Regensburg in 1557, at Augsburg in 1559, and again, after the Council of Trent, at Augsburg in 1566; until finally, after a contention of almost half a century, what Luther had demanded at the Leipzig disputation, *independence of the jurisdiction of the Pope and of the decision of councils*, was now secured.

These antagonisms, and the watchfulness they induced, brought the Lutherans to a distinct consciousness of independent exist-

* See Dr. Karl Müller, *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 63. Band, February, 1889, pp. 124, 125.

ence as an ecclesiastical party. And as their enjoyment and transmission of religious liberty in the Empire were based on the Augsburg Confession and guaranteed by adherence to the same, it was but natural that the Confession should come into prominence as a symbol, in the sense of an authorized statement of the Lutheran faith. Hence subscription to it and the naming of it in the Church Orders and in other formulas became more frequent, and in some cases the form of statement was tolerably rigid. But movement in this direction was so slight for some years as almost to escape detection. Only after the Diet of Princes at Naumburg, in 1561, does the change become marked. Hence Gieseler is quite right in saying: "In the older Church Orders there is usually reference to the Scriptures, and also a compendium of doctrine or reference to other books or guides, *e. g.*, Luther's Postils, his interpretation of the Epistle to the Galatians. However, after the Augsburg Confession had been subscribed anew at the Diet of Princes in Naumburg, February 8th, and was recognized as the standard for all the churches of the land, it was more frequently made binding in the regular Church Orders." * The Augsburg Religious Peace gave the occasion for, and the Naumburg Diet formally introduced, a change, which finally brought rigid confessionalism into the Lutheran Church. Therefore it is this second fact that makes the Naumburg Diet an important event in the Confessional History of the Lutheran Church.

1. *The Naumburg Diet of 1561.*

At the Colloquy held at Worms in 1557 it became perfectly evident that the theologians and Princes who professed adherence to the Augsburg Confession were not in harmony with each other. The Weimar-Jena theologians, supported by Duke John Frederick, demanded, as a condition of their participation in the Colloquy, that the other Lutheran theologians present should join them in "the rejection of all sects and false doctrines *in specie* and by name, as those of Zwingli, Osiander, Major, the Adiaphorists and others." † When the other Lutheran theologians refused to join in this *Protestatio* of the Weimar-Jena theologians, the latter left Worms, bitterly denouncing their co-religionists of the Augsburg Confession. Thereupon the Catholics refused to hold a colloquy, alleging that the Lutherans were divided and that the conflict which had arisen made it doubtful

* *Church History*, IV., p. 400, note 32. † C. R. IX., 285.

who really were adherents of the Augsburg Confession, and that they were bound by the Regensburg Recess to hold a disputation only with the adherents of the Augsburg Confession.*

Now the Jesuits became more active than ever in their efforts to outlaw the Lutherans, that is, to have them excluded from the benefits of the Augsburg Religious Peace. They declared in the public diets and in other assemblies, that the Lutherans had departed from the Augsburg Confession, and had published different editions of it, and had changed it, so that it was impossible to say which is the true Augsburg Confession. They also declared that even the Sacramentarians had taken shelter under the name of the Augsburg Confession, and were scattering their false doctrines under pretense that they were adherents of the Augsburg Confession.†

The reproaches of the Catholics were just. The Lutherans were not united. They had published different editions of the Confession and had placed the later editions on an equal footing with the earlier, or rather, had allowed the later editions to exclude the earlier from use. At the Augsburg Religious Peace they had refused to limit themselves to the Confession as delivered in the year 1530, declaring that "to draw matters within such narrow limits would create distrust," and "that it was best to follow the Passau Treaty, in which the Confession was named in a general way, without the year." ‡ And it was true that Calvinists (not the Sacramentarians, for the Calvinists were not Sacramentarians) had taken shelter under the Augsburg Confession, as they could not be excluded from doing by the terms of the Augsburg Religious Peace. They were adherents of the Augsburg Confession as that Confession was more generally understood and most widely used at that time.

The situation was painful, in that it revealed a sadly distracted Lutheran Church. It was perilous, in that before the Council of Trent, about to reassemble, the Lutherans might have to show cause why they should not be deprived of the rights guaranteed by the Augsburg Religious Peace.

Now it was, while confronting such a situation and the probabilities for evil that it manifestly involved, that the Elector Frederick Palatine, Duke John Frederick of Saxony, Duke Christopher of Würtemberg and Palsgrave Wolfgang met at Hils-

* *Realencyclopädie,*[2] Vol. XVII., p. 324.
† Anton, *Geschichte der Concordienformel*, pp. 82, 83.
‡ Von Ranke, Seventh Ed., vol. V., 262.

bach and resolved to undertake the work of unification in the Lutheran Church. It was proposed that the Augsburg Confession of 1530, with a preface and a conclusion adapted to the times, should be subscribed anew. Also that the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles, in so far as they concerned the chief articles of the Christian faith, should also be received. Then all the Estates of the Augsburg Confession must pledge themselves to stand by these confessions, to tolerate no sects in their lands, and to permit no controversies among the theologians. It was also agreed that no one should bring any theologian with him except his own court chaplain.

John Frederick, whose theologians had been the most bitter and violent of all in the controversies of the times, was the most active and enthusiastic of all in these preliminary arrangements. When an agreement had been reached, he went to Duke Christopher and exclaimed: "Brother, give me your hand!" and after reaching his hand, continued, "I say to you on my honor, if the Augsburg Confession shall be subscribed *de novo* and the promise shall be given *hinc inde* by the Electors and Princes, I will so conduct myself towards the Elector of Saxony as to show him that he is to have a true friend in me, and may God torment me if in this matter I am seeking any revenge or self-interest. It is time for us to be getting together." *

John Frederick also interviewed Augustus, Elector of Saxony, and laid the plan before him, both *viva voce* and in writing, with the result that it was soon agreed to call a Diet of the Princes to assemble at Naumburg, January 20, 1561, for the purpose of signing *de novo* the Augsburg Confession of 1530, so as to repel the bitter accusations made by the Catholics, to promote unity among themselves, and to consider the question of sending a delegation to the Council of Trent, which had been ordered to reassemble.† It was also declared that no secular matters and no accusations of corruptions in doctrine should be considered at the Diet, and that no league should be formed.

2. *Transactions of the Diet of Naumburg.*

According to the Protocol, the following "Electors and Princes were present at Naumburg, January 20, 1561":

Palsgrave, Elector Frederick on the Rhine.

* Calinich, *Der Naumburger Fürstentag,* pp. 81, 82.

† Calinich, *ut supra,* p. 91. Heppe, *Geschichte des Deutschen Protestantismus,* I., 378. Anton, *ut supra,* pp. 82, 83. *Realencyclopädie,*[3] XIII., 662-3.

Duke Augustus, Elector of Saxony.
Palsgrave Wolfgang.
Duke John Frederick of Saxony.
Duke Christopher of Würtemberg.
Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg.
Dukes Ernest and Philip of Brunswick.
Margrave Carl of Baden.
George Ernest, Count and Lord of Henneberg.
Casimir, Son of Palsgrave Elector.
Palsgrave Wolfgang, Cousin of John George.
Eberhart, Son of the Duke of Würtemberg.
Landgrave Philip of Hesse and his Son.
Landgrave Ludwig came 25th.
Duke Francis of Lauenburg.*

The Elector of Brandenburg and a dozen or more other Princes were represented by counsellors. The Diet was opened January 21st by the Princes without the presence of the counsellors. On the 23d a session was held in company with the counsellors. This is regarded as the first plenary session.† In all, there were twenty-one sessions, the last held February 7th. In the third session the Elector Frederick introduced four propositions, as follows:

1. Inasmuch as the different editions of the Augsburg Confession contain many variations, the different editions should be collated in the presence of all the Princes, and then it shall be decided which copy shall be subscribed.

2. They should consult whether or not a Preface should be prefixed to the Confession to be subscribed anew, in which the occasion for this transaction should be clearly explained.

3. Whether the Emperor should be informed of the purpose of this Diet at Naumburg by letter or by an embassy.

4. It should be considered whether and how the Princes, cities and Estates of the Augsburg Confession who had not been invited to the Diet could be induced to subscribe.‡

In the fourth session, January 24th, began the comparison of the different editions of the Confession. Von Minkwitz, chancellor of the Palantine Elector, read the copy of 1531, and Dr. Cracow, counsellor of Elector Augustus, read the corresponding Article of the edition of 1542. The Elector Frederick held in his

* Calinich, *ut supra*, pp. 133, 134.
† Calinich, *ut supra*, p. 138. Heppe, *ut supra*, p. 381.
‡ Calinich, *ut supra*, p. 140.

hand the edition of 1540, and Duke Christopher had in hand the Brentz manuscript of the Confession. Dr. Brück, chancellor of the Duke of Saxony, held in hand what was supposed to be a copy of the original, the Spalatin manuscript. The comparison of the Latin copies occupied this entire day and the forenoon of the next day, while in the afternoon of the 25th the German copies were collated. The next day, January 26th, at the sixth session, the following points came up for consideration:

1. Whether the edition of 1531, or that of 1540, or that of 1542 should be adopted.

2. Whether the words of Article X., in the first edition, "that under the form of bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are present," do not seem to sanction the papal transubstantiation.

3. Whether the argument against the papal procession and the carrying round of the Host in the Article, *Of Both Species: Because the division of the Sacrament is not in harmony with Christ's institution,* can be refuted by their declaration that in the Procession both forms can be carried round.

4. How the scruple of the Elector Frederick, with reference to the words in the Article of the Mass: *Our Churches are falsely accused of having abolished the Mass, for Masses are retained,* etc., can be removed, since he cannot possibly subscribe this, because in the Palatinate the Mass and all papal ceremonies have been abolished.

5. Whether in the new Preface it were not better to make mention of the Saxon Confession (Repetitio A. C.), which is given in the Saxon Corpus Doctrinae, than of the Schmalkald Articles, and whether the Articles of the Lord's Supper, of the Procession and of the Mass should not be briefly explained *de novo* in the Preface.*

All the Princes declared themselves in favor of discussing these five points, and appointed the next session for their discussion.

In the session of the 27th the question, Which edition of the Augsburg Confession shall be subscribed, and which of the other evangelical confessions shall be subscribed along with it was considered? † "Elector Frederick declared for the subscription of the German and Latin texts of the Confession of 1540, be-

* Heppe, *ut supra,* pp. 383, 384. Calinich, *ut supra,* p. 146. Salig, III., 673.

† At the third session Duke John Frederick, in connection with Palsgrave Wolfgang and Ulrich of Mecklenburg, had proposed the subscription of the Schmalkald Articles in connection with the Confession.

cause this, in meaning, is not only in harmony with the original, but also more clearly explains that. Yet some statements must be made in the Preface.

"The Elector of Saxony, had the Electors and Princes present favored it, would likewise have been for the subscription of the Confession of 1540, and that for the reason that in the life-time of the Elector John Frederick, of Luther and Melanchthon, it had been prepared, accorded *in vero sensu* with the Confession that had been delivered, and in Church, school and house has been used without question up to the present. But since the instruction to the delegates had reference only to the Confession of 1530, he consequently favored subscription to the Confession of 1531, which was the second print, and was most perfectly in accord with the first (Confession). In this way they could also anticipate the allegation that they had now subscribed more or less than had been delivered at Augsburg *Anno* 1530, and in this way also the question could not arise, as to whether the Religious Recess and the Religious Peace, which was established for the Confession which had been delivered, are to be held or not. But in the Preface the Confession of 1540 could be regarded as an explanation of that presented in the year 1530.

"With him agreed the legate of the Elector of Brandenburg.

"The Duke of Saxony would have preferred that the Latin and German text of Spalatin's copy should be received for subscription. But since the other Princes and the legates would accredit no authority to that, he was satisfied to have the copy of the second edition of 1531 and the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles subscribed. Reference could be made to the ampler (locupletirten) editions in the Preface.

"For the same edition of 1531 decided also Palsgrave Wolfgang, Mecklenburg and Würtemberg, the latter with the addition that the German Confession should be taken from the manuscript copies, and that the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles belong ad deliberationem de concilio. The Preface should make reference to all the amplified confessions. Also the Landgrave of Hesse decided for the edition of 1531, but wished that the amplified confessions should be properly estimated in the Preface, because they reproduce and properly explain the true sense of that delivered. The Margrave of Baden, the legate of Margrave Hans of Brandenburg and of Margrave George Frederick voted with the Elector and with Brandenburg, the latter asking that the Apology, the amplified Confession and Schmalkald Articles

be mentioned in the Preface, and with proviso of a further explanation from the Word of God. The legate of Duke Hans of Mecklenburg would subscribe no copy except that of 1530. Holstein and Lauenburg agreed with the Elector. Anhalt accepted the edition of 1531 only in so far as it agreed with the Confession that was delivered; but if hereafter a genuine copy be discovered, which contains more or less, then that shall have authority. Pomerania abstained from voting, and the Dukes of Lüneburg had only received written instruction to remain steadfast by the Augsburg Confession." *

When the Elector of the Palatinate discovered that the Elector of Saxony was not opposed to the edition of 1540 on principle, he decided to stand by him, but wished to maintain the Frankfort Recess and to subscribe the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles—the latter, no doubt, because of its decided attitude towards the Pope. Finally, on the 28th, it was agreed that neither the Schmalkald Articles, nor the Frankfort Recess, nor the *Confessio Saxonica,* should be mentioned, but that, instead of these, mention should be made of the Apology and of the Augsburg Confession of 1540.†

It was decided that Melanchthon's quarto edition in German (*editio princeps*) and the octavo edition in Latin should be subscribed—*both as the Augsburg Confession of 1530.* Some have attributed the selection of the *octavo* edition to the ignorance of the Princes and of the theologians in regard to the different Melanchthon editions of the Confession (see p. 219). But a recently discovered letter, written by the Elector Palatine, July 29, 1563, seems to offer a solution of the difficult question. This letter says that the *octavo* edition was chosen because it does not contain the words *under the form of bread and wine,* and that the words, *mutato pane,* etc., do not stand in the Apology that accompanied this *octavo* edition—a part of which is an error and a part is true. The words *sub specie panis et vini* never appeared in any Latin edition. The words *mutato pane,* etc., were removed from the Apology that accompanied the *octavo* edition, and had not appeared in the German Apology. But as the Apology was held to be the proper explanation of the Confession, and as the Apology—of course the *octavo* edition—was to be mentioned in the Preface, the offense given by Article X., as the same had

* Calinich, pp. 160-162.

† Calinich, p. 162; Salig, III., 680; Heppe, p. 387; *Realencyclopädie,*[3] III., 665.

been explained in the Latin *editio princeps* of the Apology, would be removed.* (See pp. 264 *et seqq.*)

In all probability the Elector Palatine's letter gives the true reason for the choice of the *octavo* edition of the Confession with its attendant edition of the Apology. The evidence is conclusive that the choice was deliberate and purposeful. But why call this edition the Augsburg Confession of 1530? The Princes and the theologians knew that it was not such. The ethical situation is not explained by the supposition that the Princes and the theologians thought that the German *quarto* edition was the Confession of 1530. But the evidence is conclusive that the Princes laid no decisive emphasis on any particular edition of the Confession, since in their estimation the editions did not differ in their teaching. Their chief aim, as the sequel shows, was to vindicate themselves against the allegations of the Papists that they had departed from the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession. And for them to have singled out any one edition, and to have said, *this* is the Augsburg Confession which our fathers delivered, and to which they adhered, and to which we have adhered, would have involved them in confusion and in contradiction, since their fathers had adhered to all the Melanchthon editions with equal tenacity, and had employed the later editions in diets; and these Princes themselves, the Landgrave of Hesse excepted, had scarcely known any other than the later editions, and had used the Melanchthon editions that appeared after the *editio princeps*, or had allowed them to be used, in their dominions, almost to the entire exclusion of the *editio princeps*. And their choice of the *octavo* edition to represent the Augsburg Confession of the year 1530 cannot be justified on the ground that this edition bears on its title-page the declaration: "*Delivered to the Most Invincible Emperor Charles V., Caesari Aug.* in the Diet of Augsburg anno M. D. XXX.," for the same identical declaration stands on the title-page of each of the Melanchthon Latin editions. The only explanation that will now square with the facts is that given by Calinich, and accepted by Kawerau, "that since the Estates were not yet willing to confess Transubstantiation in common with the Papists in this controverted article, it would not be difficult for the Elector Frederick to determine them in the case of the Latin Confession to subscribe the *octavo* edition." † But they

* Calinich, pp. 165, 166. Kawerau in *Realencyclopädie*, XIII., 665. *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1870, pp. 419 *et seqq.*

† Calinich, *ut supra*, p. 166. Kawerau, *ut supra*, p. 665.

had no right to call this *octavo* edition, nor even the German *editio princeps,* the Augsburg Confession "which at the Diet in the year 1530 had been delivered to the Emperor Charles V. of tender memory."

But not less significant than the choice of editions of the Confession was the Preface which was prepared by the two Electors present and submitted to the other Estates. This Preface to the Augsburg Confession, addressed to the Emperor, begins by saying that the adherents of the Augsburg Confession have been accused of not being united in the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and of having suffered many different interpretations of the same. To this they reply that they "tolerate, suffer and defend no other doctrine than that which is founded upon the Holy Scriptures and incorporated in the aforesaid Augsburg Confession," and have resolved to receive no other doctrine in their lands, churches and schools, than that contained in the said Confession, and to reject all doctrines that are in conflict with it. They declare that they adhere to the chief symbols, and that, as their forefathers delivered their Confession in the German and Latin languages to the Emperor at the Diet of Augsburg, so they adhere to the same Confession as it was published at Wittenberg in the year 1531.

"Then, although afterwards, in the years 1540 and 1542, the said Confession was repeated in a somewhat more stately and elaborate manner, explained and enlarged on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, and subsequently was again, at the Colloquy of Worms, delivered by the adherents of such Confession to the Imperial President and Collocutors, and received by them and made the subject of colloquy: so we at this time wish to take in hand the said published Confession, in order that now the Emperor may perceive and learn that it is not our intention and purpose to defend or promulgate any other or a new unsupported doctrine." It is their intention to abide by this doctrine and to transmit it to their posterity.

"But by no means is it our intention and purpose by this repetition and subscription of the said first printed Confession to deviate in the least or suffer ourselves to be deflected from the Confession as explained and again delivered in the year 1540. For the same, after numerous interviews and disputations with the opposite party in regard to several articles, was set forth the more elaborately in order that the divine truth might so much the more come to light, and that faith and confidence in the

satisfaction and merit of our only Mediator and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, together with the rejection of all human traditions and doctrines, may remain pure, genuine and uncorrupted, and may be transmitted to posterity.

"Thus we deviate from the same just as little as from that of our fathers, and in part our own Confession, that was delivered. And we are moved to this all the more because this explained Confession, which was published in the years 1540 and 1542, is now in use in the most of our schools and churches.

"In like manner also we wish expressly to repeat and to confess the Apology which by our forefathers, and in part by us, was offered at the Diet of Augsburg, but was not received, in the form in which it was subsequently printed at Wittenberg and presented at the Colloquy of Worms in the year 1540 in connection with the aforesaid improved Confession."

They hold themselves to this repeated Confession and Apology, and while they reject transubstantiation, "they do not deny the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper," and in the Supper Christ is truly present, and "with bread and wine, as appointed by himself, gives his body and blood to Christians, to be eaten and to be drunk."

"The said Augsburg Christian Confession, subscribed anew," they present to the Emperor as evidence of their agreement in doctrine, and as a refutation of the slanders that have been brought to him about their disagreement in doctrine and their departure from the Augsburg Confession.*

Friday, February 7th, the Preface and the Confession were signed and sealed by the two Electors present and by a dozen other Princes or by their representatives, and they all pledged themselves to influence other rulers and cities to join them in subscribing the Confession and the Preface. But John Frederick of Saxony and Ulrich of Mecklenburg, at the instance of their theologians, had refused to subscribe, giving as the reason, that injurious errors, especially those of the Sacramentarians, had not been expressly mentioned and condemned.

John Frederick also made a formal written protest against the Preface, when its contents became known to him,† and already,

* Original text printed with modernized spelling in Struve, *Pfältzische Kirchen-H.*, pp. 132 *et seqq.* Also in the original spelling in Weber, II., *Beilage.* Given also by Hönn in his *Historia des von Denen Evangelisten Standen* Anno 1561. *Zu Naumburg* (1704), pp. 99 *et seqq.* Hönn gives the names of the subscribers, pp. 114-115. Twenty-six names in all are attached to the document, but only fourteen with seals.

† Salig, III., 652 *et seqq.* Gieseler, *Church History,* IV., 455. *Realen-*

February 3d, four days before the Preface was signed, he stole away between five and six o'clock in the morning, and returned to Weimar, followed by his counsellors and theologians.

Thus the very man who, at Hilsbach, had insisted that the Princes should not be attended by their theologians, was the very man who allowed himself to be most influenced by his theologians. He had brought with him two of the most violent of the Flacianists, Stössel and Mörlin, and the Jena Flacianists had sent Matthew Judex to act as lobbyist. These, together with Chytraeus, did all that they could to keep the Duke from subscribing the Preface. Finally, when Mörlin and Stössel declared that if he signed the Preface they would lay down their office and withdraw from his service, he replied that he would mount his horse and leave with them before he would sign a Preface in which the errors had not been condemned;* and yet it had been distinctly declared in calling the Diet that neither secular matters nor corruptions were to be mentioned.

Thus the chief purpose for which the Diet was called, namely, to present a united Lutheran front against the allegations of the Catholics, was, in large part, defeated by the Flacianists, whose policy it had been, and was and remained, that they would not unite with other Lutherans on their Confession and Apology, except upon the condition that the others unite with them in their sweeping condemnation of errors and errorists, that is, in effect, accept their own *Confutation Book* of 1559, in which they publish: 1. *Confutation of the Error of Servetus.* 2. *Confutation of the Error of Schwenckfeld.* 3. *Confutation of the Error of the Antinomians.* 4. *Confutation of the Error of the Anabaptists.* 5. *Confutation of the Corruptions of Zwingli and Calvin in Regard to the Lord's Supper.* 6. *Confutation of the Corruption in the Article of Free-will.* 7. *Confutation of the Errors of Osiander and Stancar in the Article of Justification.* 8. *Confutation of the Error of Major, that Good Works are Necessary to Salvation.* 9. *Confutation of Adiaphorism.*

To this *Confutation Book,* which in its final shaping experienced the hand of Flacius, the pastors and theologians of Ducal Saxony were commanded to subscribe. Hence at its bottom this opposition of John Frederick to the Preface of the Princes was essentially a strife between the Flacianists and the Princes, or

cyclopädie,[3] XV., p. 326. The Protest is given by Hönn, *ut supra,* pp. 42 *et seqq.,* and is dated, Naumburg, am 2. Febr. 1561.

* Preger *Matthias Flacius Illyricus,* II., 98; Calinich, *ut supra,* pp. 141 *et seqq.;* 151 *et seqq.;* 185 *et seqq.* Salig, III., 686-690.

more accurately described, it was a conflict between John Frederick, led by the Flacianists, who were bitterly antagonistic to Leipzig and Wittenberg, and to the other Princes; or, narrowed down to its minutest point, it was a new outburst of the hate entertained by Duke John Frederick towards the Elector Augustus, whose brother, Maurice, had dispossessed the Duke's father of the Electorate. Thus political animosity entered as a factor into the conduct of John Frederick at Naumburg. Here, as elsewhere, John Frederick breathed a spirit of bigotry and of narrow exclusiveness, which has ever since haunted portions of the Lutheran Church, and has made it weak where it ought to have been, and ought to be, strong. But, as is usual with men of the Flacianist temper, these extremists soon fell out among themselves. "They who were chiefly at fault in frustrating union," says Wangemann, "were the first to be punished. The Flacianist theologians at Jena, who, through their influence on John Frederick, strengthened him in his resistance, fell that same year under his displeasure on account of their resistance to his ducal command with reference to the *Saxon Consistorial Order*, and were dismissed. Duke John Frederick himself, who, by the interview at Hilsbach, had given occasion for the Naumburg Diet, and who afterwards, by his protest, contributed most to defeat its purposes and designs—defiant, stubborn, capricious, wholly accessible to evil counsel and passionate insinuations—went blindly to his inevitable fate" *—the loss of his ducal authority and life-long imprisonment, while the very theologians who counselled him at Naumburg denounced his *Consistorial Order* as "Cæsaropapism."

2. *Theological Estimates.*

Turning now from the transactions of the Naumburg Diet to theological estimates of those transactions, we naturally may expect to find differences of opinion. "Those to whom the Flacianist sect had transmitted and communicated their rigid orthodoxy and their *Symbololatry*, have much evil to speak about it. On the contrary, the Reformed boast that the Princes at Naumburg endorsed the Altered Confession, consequently, the Reformed doctrine of the Holy Sacrament." These are the extremes of opinion, and neither is justified by the facts. The Naumburg Diet expressed a large amount of united sentiment in the Lutheran Church and opposed a strong barrier to the papal allega-

* Herzog,[2] X., 444, 445.

tions. It undoubtedly strengthened the Augsburg Religious Peace and enlarged the sphere of its availability. In these and in other respects the Diet did good, and is not to be held responsible for the perverse uses which the Flacianists made of it. The Naumburg Diet did not endorse the Reformed or Calvinistic view of the Sacrament. The doctrine of the Sacrament which it teaches is exactly the doctrine of the Sacrament held and taught in the Lutheran Church so long as Luther and Melanchthon lived, and exactly that which was taught and held in nearly all the churches of the Princes who signed the Preface. It is between these extremes that the true significance of the Diet of Naumburg lies. It placed three editions of the Augsburg Confession, the one sole fundamental confession of the Lutheran Church, exactly on a level, and it places these editions of the Confession in chronological order, not in an order of rank. The Princes distinctly declare that the later editions are in harmony with the older edition, which they call the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and that the later editions are "explained and enlarged on the basis of the Holy Scriptures"; they further declare that they "will not suffer themselves to be deflected from the Confession as explained and again delivered in the year 1540." By their perfect equation of these three editions of the Confession they exclude all thought of bias, whether it be in favor of the Flacianists or of the Calvinists. They mean to teach the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, though their explanation of the same is in the language of Melanchthon, rather than in that of Luther, though Melanchthon's doctrine was Lutheran; and no man to this day has shown the contrary. And that he changed Article X. with the knowledge and approval of Luther, and to guard it against a catholicizing interpretation has been established by Chemnitz and Selneccer in a way that admits of absolutely no doubt whatever, and their testimony and the proof they give have been unqualifiedly accepted by Salig, who is at the same time the most learned and the most impartial of all the great historians of the Augsburg Confession.*

But the evidence shows that the Princes at Naumburg were not influenced by any partisan consideration. They had before them a far more important problem than any that had been raised by the theologians. How could they best answer the allegation of the Romanists? Had they decided for one edition in preference to another, they would have established the allega-

* Salig, III., 705, 711.

tions of their enemies. Their fathers had subscribed the Confession of 1530, had approved the editions of 1531, and had employed the editions of 1540 and 1542 in Diets, and they themselves had it in use in nearly all their churches. Here were facts that stared them in the face. It was a political and an ecclesiastical necessity which drove them to make their Preface just what it was, though the facts show beyond question that their preference was for the edition of 1540. It cannot be denied that the true, legalized Confession was that which was delivered to the Emperor in 1530. The Princes had to have a legalized and a recognized starting point. That for this and for no other reason they name the earlier form of the Confession is plainly enough declared in their Preface. But they cannot ignore or repudiate those editions of the Confession which at that time were in official use in their churches and schools. These were the editions of 1540 and 1542. "In consequence of the colloquies held with the papists, these editions, in the eyes of the Princes, were nothing else than improved and explained editions of the original Confession, which are to be interpreted only in the right Lutheran sense of the first Confession, which had been legally sanctioned in the Empire, and from which they did not dare to part without infracting the Religious Peace. Had this not been the case, and had they, through the non-recognition of the editions of 1540 and 1542, given place to the supposition that these editions in any way collided with the unaltered, they would have acknowledged the allegations of their opponents, which they wished to refute." * And to this must be added the fact, also noted by Calinich, that "even good Lutheran theologians of that time, with the sole exception of the Flacianist ultras, regarded the editions of 1531, 1540 and 1542 absolutely not in an antithetical or in a one-sided Melanchthonian sense," that is, acknowledged that the later editions were in harmony with the earlier.†

* Calinich, *ut supra*, p. 175.

† In addition to what we have said about the *Variata* of 1540 on page 226, we add the following from Salig, whose Lutheran integrity cannot be impeached: "The tenth Article of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, Of the Supper, was so stated that the Papists in their Confutation of 1530 allowed it to pass, because it could be interpreted in favor of transubstantiation. When Melanchthon saw that the Papists endorsed it, he changed this Article in order that it might no longer bear the suspicion of transubstantiation. This Altered Confession passed current in the Lutheran Church, and as the Naumburg Princes wrote in their Preface, was received in most of the Lutheran churches and schools. This is an undeniable fact, and if anybody doubts it, let him only read Hesshuss' Confession, who expressly adhered to the tenth Article of the Altered Augsburg Confession, although

And yet, while it is true, as said above, that the Naumburg Diet developed a large amount of united sentiment in the Luth-

he was the sworn enemy of the so-called Sacramentarians, and was, as Boyle writes of Westphal, prodigieusement Lutherien. Chemnitz, who certainly was not deficient in Lutheran doctrine, though he was more moderate than the others, has in his book, *Of the Holy Supper,* openly cited the tenth Article of the Altered Confession, and what his views of this Confession were has been already shown. These are potent facts which we neither can nor should deny, otherwise we make a romance out of history, or accept or reject facts as it may suit our fancy and pleasure.'' Salig says further: ''The theologians charged it as a great sin against the Princes at Naumburg that they wrote of the Altered Confession: In 1540-42 it was repeated in a somewhat more stately and elaborate manner, explained and enlarged on the basis of the Holy Scriptures. But that even Brentz and Selneccer found no fault with the Altered Confession, I have already shown. But as Selneccer may have expressed himself otherwise once, I will adduce the judgment of Martin Chemnitz—because his testimony cannot be cast aside, as I am not aware that his orthodoxy has ever been impeached. This moderate and orthodox teacher wrote as follows: 'The edition of the Augsburg Confession published in 1531 cannot and should not be rejected, for it is the true Augsburg Confession as it was delivered to the Emperor Charles V. in 1530. This edition was also subscribed at Schmalkald in 1537. [See pp. 268 *et seqq.*] Neither do I see any profit or propriety in rejecting or condemning the edition of 1540. For when, in 1540, the Colloquy was held at Hagenau, and it was thought proper to present a statement and form of the doctrine of our churches, it was printed with a fuller explanation at Wittenberg with reference to the subject matter of the Colloquy. This edition was also presented the same year at Worms as the Augsburg Confession. This edition was also presented to the Papists at the Colloquy in Ratisbon as the form of doctrine of our churches, and that indeed by the advice and the wish of Luther and with his permission and approbation. Also our friends in 1546 and afterwards in all the Diets and transactions on religion appealed to this edition, which was called the Augsburg Confession. . . . Yet, even Cochlaeus at Worms in the year 1540, and Piglius in 1541 at Ratisbon were very cognizant of the fact that by a fuller explanation more light had been thrown on several articles. For they saw from this that the truth was clearer, and that the Babylonian Thais was more clearly removed; and as their writings show they would have preferred that the Wittenberg edition of 1531 should have been retained. But since the edition of 1540 was used by everybody, the first edition of 1531 was scarcely known or has been seen by anyone; and since the edition of 1540 has in it nothing false and incorrect, but *only certain necessary explanations,* I do not at all see that it can be simply or absolutely rejected and condemned without disturbing the churches. Therefore it seems most fitting that the edition of the year 1531 should be restored to the churches and commended as a full and primary authority. Also let the edition of 1540 be retained as an explanation, which is not to conflict with, but in all respects is to be regarded in agreement with the first edition.' [The Latin quoted by Köllner, *Symbolik,* I., 256.]

''It is astonishing that Chytraeus at Naumburg should give Duke Ulrich such advice as he did give, since in his *History of the Augsburg Confession* he has written expressly that the *Augsburg Confession and Apology,* in the copies of which there is dissimilarity, was enlarged and improved in the life-time of Luther; and there is no doubt that with the knowledge of Luther they were presented to the Papists by the Evangelicals at the colloquies of Worms and Ratisbon.'' Salig, III., 711, 712.

Thus, if there be any blame for the change of the Confession, Luther is as much to blame as is Melanchthon. And there is not in existence a single word, approved as authentic by candid historians, which indicates that Luther ever expressed a word of disapproval either of the *changed* Confession or of Melanchthon. This may be said absolutely without the fear of

eran Church, it is also true that it served to sharpen antagonisms already in existence. It widened the breach between the Palatinate and Ducal Saxony, and between Ernestine and the Albertine lines of the House of Saxony, that is, more particularly between Duke John Frederick and the Elector Augustus. In a short time the theologians of Tübingen, Jena, Bremen, Hamburg, Magdeburg, Brunswick, and others called those of Electoral Saxony (Leipzig and Wittenberg), the Palatinate, Hesse, Pomerania, Prussia and others, Crypto-Calvinists, and Adiaphorists, and denied that they were true Lutherans. Salig says that some Lutheran theologians declared that they would rather have fellowship with the Catholics than with the Calvinists, since the former held to the presence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament, but the latter enervated and entirely destroyed the Sacrament. The Tübingers and Bremenese maintained the doctrine of the ubiquity of the human nature of Christ. The Hildesheimers and others dug up the earth on which a drop of the consecrated wine had fallen. Hesshuss and Musculus maintained a kind of adoration of the Sacrament. Mörlin and others believed a bodily presence apart from participation in the Sacrament. The charge of Crypto-Calvinism was met by the counter-charge of Crypto-Catholicism—the one as justifiable as the other. The ultras appealed to the "unaltered" Augsburg Confession and sought to find in it support for their newly-invented terms about the Sacrament. The other side replied: "To spite us you now want to bring up again the tenth Article of the unaltered Confession, although you know that Melanchthon changed it during the lifetime of Luther, because the Papists understood it in the sense of transubstantiation." (Salig, III., 707.)

Thus the times were sadly out of joint for the Lutheran Church. The adherents of the Augsburg Confession had triumphed over their enemies, but now, like the Cadmean brothers,

contradiction. On the contrary, that Luther approved it, and consented to its official use in Diets, must pass without question. And there is not in existence a single word that justifies the suspicion put out by the Flacianists that Melanchthon changed Article X. to placate the Sacramentarians or the Calvinists. On the contrary, at Worms in 1557 he subscribed without hesitation the Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, and not only did he there join others in condemning the Zwinglians, but with his own hand he wrote the condemnations which were desired by his colleagues, Schnepf *et al.* Köllner, *Symbolik*, I., 248, *note* 15; 258-9, *note* 4. For further information on the subject, see Köllner, *Symbolik*, I., 254 *et seqq.*, and the literature indicated. Also *The Lutheran Quarterly* (1888), pp. 364-368, and the same for 1898, pp. 562 *et seqq.* Weber, *Kritische Geschichte*, II., 306 *et seqq.*

they were fighting each other. They separated those whom God had joined together. Some made *Lutherism* the whole of Lutheranism. These trekked towards orthodoxism, bigotry, symbololatry. Some accepted *Melanchthonism* as the whole of Lutheranism. These trekked in the direction of indistinctness, liberalism, inferior appreciation of the symbols. But Luther and Melanchthon would have repudiated their respective followers as described above, because they drew false conclusions from the premises that had been most centrally and most obviously emphasized at Wittenberg. And we must repudiate them to-day, and also their lineal successors, who seem to have forgotten that the Lutheran Church had a Luther and a Melanchthon, a Melanchthon and a Luther, and seem not to know that neither *Lutherism* nor *Melanchthonism* is the whole of *Lutheranism*. Lutheranism is *Lutherism* and *Melanchthonism* combined. Luther could not have wrought the German Religious Reformation of the sixteenth century. Neither could Melanchthon have wrought it. The former was the great religious genius. The latter was the learned theologian. Luther was the more original. Melanchthon was the more logical. Luther quickened and impelled Melanchthon. Melanchthon restrained and moderated Luther. Luther adored Melanchthon's splendid gifts. Melanchthon adored Luther's majestic spirit. Together they wrought in harmony, and together they laid the foundation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Melanchthon wrote the Augsburg Confession. Luther approved it. Melanchthon changed the Augsburg Confession. Luther approved the changes. Luther furnished the element of stability in the Lutheran Church. Melanchthon provided the principle of progress in the Lutheran Church. With Luther alone as forerunner, the Lutheran Church would have become, and would now become, the *orthodox* Church of the West. With Melanchthon alone as forerunner, the Lutheran Church would have become, and would now become, one of the sects of the West. With Luther and Melanchthon together as forerunners she has been, and she will remain, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, based on the Prophets and Apostles and on Jesus Christ, the true Cornerstone. Luther will furnish the living spirit for her theology, and will conserve all the *good* old. Melanchthon will furnish the literary form for her theology and will appropriate all the *good* new that is furnished by science and experience. This will make the Lutheran Church both conservative and progressive. And without being both, she cannot hold a high place and exert a

wide influence in the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, of which she rightly confesses herself a member.

It was the disregard of this principle—it was the separation of Luther and Melanchthon, the building upon one to the exclusion of the other, or rather, upon the accidental or incidental subordinate propositions of the one or of the other—it was the partial and defective appropriation of Lutheranism, joined with the political rivalries and personal animosities of the Princes, that brought to the second generation of adherents of the Augsburg Confession strifes as bitter, and antagonisms as noxious, as were those that fell upon the Church in the fourth and fifth centuries of her history. The Diet of Naumburg stood for Lutheran union, for Luther and Melanchthon. In part it effected union. But it was made the occasion by the Flacianists to intensify and perpetuate their one-sided and unhistorical emphasis of the Confessions. Hence it is from this time that the Confessions emerge more and more into prominence as *symbols,** and soon we have the distinction of *"unaltered"* and *altered* Augsburg Confession—the word *"unaltered"* standing in the conceptions of that day for the Confession as it had been delivered to the Emperor Charles V., June 25, 1530, and the word *altered* standing for the Latin edition of 1540, as we have shown on page 232, though the word *"unaltered"* can be scarcely regarded as a *watchword* prior to the year 1576.

3. *The Church Orders.*

The Jena *Consistorial Order* of 1569 declares that "no person shall be a member of the Consistory who will not openly and distinctly confess himself to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, to the three ancient creeds, to the Augsburg Confession and Apology, and likewise to the Schmalkald Articles." †

The *Synodical Statutes* of Pomerania (1574) required "all pastors and ministers to consent and agree in a sincere consensus of the heavenly doctrine according to the Prophetical and Apostolical Scriptures, the Symbols, the Augsburg Confession, its Apology, and the Catechisms of Luther." ‡

The *Lüneburg Order* (1575) requires that the candidate for the ministry "shall make his confession in harmony with the

* Gieseler, *Church History,* IV., 399, 400, note 32. Dr. Karl Müller, *Preussiche Jahrbücher,* February, 1889, p. 125.

† Richter, *Kirchenordnungen,* II., 325.

‡ Richter, *ut supra,* II., 386.

Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther and the Anti-Interim Confession of the cities of Hamburg, Lübeck, Lüneburg." *

In the Hohenlohe *Corpus Doctrinae* (1577) we read as follows: "The writings of the Prophets and Apostles of the Old and New Testaments as the sole *norma judicii;* the three ancient Symbols, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, Luther's Catechisms, the Repetition of the Augsburg Confession, Melanchthon's *Loci* and the present Church order. Other writings of the Church teachers shall be understood and explained according to this Corpus Doctrinae. The controversial and impure books of the Papists, Calvinists *et al.* shall not be used, and controversial matters about religion shall not be brought to the pulpit." †

These are all, or at least nearly all, of the more rigid and comprehensive forms of confessional subscription as introduced and employed between the Naumburg Diet and the introduction of the Book of Concord (1580). Taken as they read, they, with the one exception, seem to place the Confessions on a level with the Holy Scriptures. If this was their meaning and intent, then they were at variance with that fundamental principle of the Reformation which made the Word of God the sole *norma judicii.* At least, in those formulas and requirements we find the beginnings of the exaltation of the Confessions, and we begin to miss that lofty and almost exclusive regard for the Holy Scriptures which is so manifest in the earlier Orders, and especially in the writings of Luther and Melanchthon. It is easy to see that in some places a new generation has arisen. This certainly is clear: In this second quarter-century of Lutheran history the Lutheran Confessions have, in many places, acquired an authority which their authors and earlier subscribers did not intend that they should have, and which they did not have from 1530 to 1555. At first, the Confessions were intended to be apologetic defenses of the doctrines and practices of the Lutherans at that particular time. Now they are beginning to be made *normae judicii* for testing other writings and for guaranteeing soundness in the faith. Though still in by far the larger number of the Orders in use in this period, the Confessions are not even named. In some there are instructions, and in some mild forms of subscription. In the Waldeck Order the pastors are to teach, hold and believe as God has revealed himself in the Scriptures,

* Richter, *ut supra,* 398. † Richter, *ut supra,* II., 400.

as set forth in the three Symbols, in the Catechism and Confession of Luther, in the Augsburg Confession and in the Apology.* In the Würtemberg Order of 1559 the minister is to be examined on the articles of the Christian faith according to the Holy Scriptures, the Augsburg Confession and the Würtemberg Confession.† In the Brandenburg Order, 1573, the minister is required in all his official acts to abide by the content of the Augsburg Confession and the Church Order.‡ Sometimes the *Loci* of Melanchthon, and sometimes the Schmalkald Articles, are named, as in the Zweibrücken Order of 1557, and in the Lippe Order of 1571. But there is nothing like a uniform practice, and the methods of reference to the Confessions are different. It is evident that the change of the Confessions from witnesses to symbols was gradual. The process has been thus described by Köllner, whom the elder Philippi calls an impartial judge:

"As regards the authority to be assigned to the Symbols in the Lutheran Church, there has always been, and still is, a difference of opinion. It was a fundamental principle of this Church not to allow itself to be bound by any word or writing of man; and yet this Church was the first to depart from that principle. In an historical examination of the authority that has attended the Symbols, a distinction must be made between the moral estimation of an individual, or even of a great many, and the public authority in so far as this was expressed by subscription to the Symbols for faith and doctrine. The moral estimation in which the Symbols, especially the Augsburg Confession, were held from the beginning was very high. At first the authority was based chiefly on the opposition from without—the Symbols were only the expression of what was believed—but as has always been the case, very soon stress was laid on their doctrinal system as a norm of faith within. The Symbols became the norm of what must now be believed. When and how this was first done by public authority is a matter very difficult to determine. Traces and indications of it are often deceptive, because cases in which subscription was only requested and given voluntarily, may easily be quoted as cases in which subscription was commanded. But the truth appears to be about as follows: Long before the composition of the Formula of Concord so much authority was laid on the individual symbols that they were recommended as a norm

* Richter, *ut supra*, II., 169.
† Richter, *ut supra*, II., 199.
‡ Richter, *ut supra*, II., 361.

of faith and doctrine, and here and there commanded. However, this does not appear to have occurred everywhere at the same time and in the same manner. In general, prior to the composition of the Formula of Concord, or prior to the controversies which arose in consequence of its formation, the principle of binding the Symbols does not seem to have been universally present.

"But it was different at the time of the composition of the Formula of Concord, and by and through its formation. Already before this there were instances of hard coercion of faith and enforced reception of the Symbols as norms of faith and doctrine, but afterwards more. The authority of the Symbols gradually rose so high, that not only did the rulers make the reception of them, in the sense mentioned above, an indispensable condition for every service in the Church, and regarded with disfavor those who resisted, but even the theologians themselves reverenced and defended them as having like authority with the Scriptures. But there were not wanting those who opposed such abridgment of evangelical freedom, and regarded the definitions of the Symbols as oppressive, and really (though often out of dogmatic interest) made good the principle of the Evangelical Church that the Scriptures are the rule of faith and life. Thus at once after the formation and introduction of the Book of Concord opposition in the sense named arose. Yet the authority of the Symbols easily gained the victory, and there entered the Evangelical Church a period of their unqualified dominion, and with it a period of almost complete scholastic torpidity. But as this was a result of narrowing and circumscribing all theological effort by the dead letter of the Symbol, which permitted only a scholastic perfectioning within the sharply defined system, this torpidity bore in itself the seed of a new opposition to the Symbols. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, *Spener* and those of like mind were saddened in view of that scholasticism, and in view of the lack of true, elevating nourishment for a Christian spirit to be drawn from the theology of that time; and with the desire of freeing from its chains the spirit of theology that had been paralyzed by the letter of the Symbol, and with a desire of making it fruitful for heart and life, they were the first to set themselves against the excessive authority of the Symbols. After a violent controversy, everything in Germany on the field of theology gradually returned to the earlier condition." *

* *Symbolik*, I., 106-108. See also the very instructive notes, pp. 108-113.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE CONTROVERSIES WITHIN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH: IN GENERAL.

JOHN NICHOLAS ANTON, author of a history of the Form of Concord, declares: "It is certain beyond question that with Luther's death all *concord,* unity and harmony among those who were pledged to his doctrine, ceased and vanished from the earth. Luther himself, with his clear insight, had long foreseen this. From various circumstances and occurrences he concluded that under the ashes a fire was slumbering which would soon burst into flames and take a wide sweep." * John Aurifaber reports in his Preface to Luther's Table Talk, that Luther had often prophesied that after his death his doctrine would fall away because of false brethren, fanatics and sectarians, and that the doctrine, which in 1530 had stood on the heights at Augsburg, would descend into the valley, since the Word of God had seldom flourished more than forty years in one place.

All who are acquainted with the history of the Lutheran Church in the sixteenth century know how completely these previsions and prophesies of Luther were fulfilled; and likewise do such know that the beginnings of the controversies and distractions that broke out after Luther's death lay far back of that event. In reality there had not been perfect harmony in the Lutheran party since the publication of the *Visitation Articles* in 1527-8, and especially not since the contention over Private Confession and Private Absolution at Nürnberg in 1530-1533. Even at Schmalkald Melanchthon had expressed a private opinion in regard to the authority of the Pope.

Moreover, the age was one of extreme agitation. The Reformation in Germany had stirred the souls of thinking men to their lowest depths, and had brought to the surface the polemical qualities that had distinguished, first, their heathen and then, scarcely less, their semi-civilized and semi-Christian German ancestors. The fathers had fought with the sword. The sons now fight with weapons which are sharper and mightier than the sword—with the pen and the voice. The scene of conflict is changed from the open field to the study, to the chair, to the

* *Geschichte,* pp. 4, 5.

pulpit. A chief function of the theologian now is to discover and to combat heresies. Small differences in teaching, and often even in the statement of a doctrinal article, were first detected and then magnified, and then attacked with violence and virulence, as though the standing or falling of the Church depended upon the annihilation of the opposing view. It was a characteristic of the age—an age which had not yet been much refined and humanized by the Classics and the *Beaux-Arts.*

Then, too, the Lutheran Churches and the theologians were under the patronage of the State, and had to suffer the evil consequences of the rivalries, the jealousies, the feuds, the alliances, the whims and assumptions of the Princes, who, as a rule, cared more for their political aggrandizement than they did for the interests of the Church. Indeed, all things considered, the times and the conditions were totally unfavorable for peace and concord in the Lutheran Church in Germany. But so long as Luther lived his commanding personality checked all tendencies towards distractions and divisions. He had mediated between Melanchthon and Agricola in the Antinomian Controversy at the beginning (1527), and when Agricola renewed the controversy, ten years later, Luther put an end to it by his six masterly disputations against the Antinomians.* In the case of the Nürnberg dispute he sided with neither party, but declared that Private Absolution is comforting, but not necessary, since not enjoined by God's Word. He also declared that the general absolution is efficacious, and that both private and general absolution are alike conditioned in their efficacy by the faith of the recipient.† He knew of and approved the changes made by Melanchthon in the Augsburg Confession. He also knew Melanchthon's teaching on Free-will as the same was presented in the *Loci Communes* in 1535; and when this form of 1535 had passed through nine Latin and seven German editions he commended it to the Wittenberg students to be "read next to the Bible"; and when Melanchthon had still further changed the *Loci* in 1543, Luther, in the Preface to his Latin Works, written March 5, 1545, crowns it as superior to all works on systematic theology.‡ And to the day of his death, February 18, 1546, Luther defended Melanchthon from the attacks of narrow-

* Erlangen edition (Latin), IV., 424 *et seqq.*

† Köstlin-Kawerau, II., 277-8.

‡ See Matthesius, *Life of Luther.* Twelfth Sermon, and Preface to Jena Edition of Luther's Works. Credner's *Erörterungen Kirchlicher Zeitfragen,* pp. 106-110.

minded and jealous opponents, and lived in loving and grateful appreciation of Melanchthon's splendid talents and distinguished services to the cause of the Gospel.

But no sooner had Luther departed from the world than discord and strife began to do their distracting work. Turbulent spirits like Osiander (1498-1552) and Amsdorf (1483-1565) and Agricola (1492-1566), and a few others, piqued and disappointed, and harassed by events, could not endure Melanchthon's leadership at the Lutheran Metropolis. They harked back to Luther. Over against these stood the pupils of Melanchthon, who were filled with the irenical spirit of "the dear Master," and went, some of them, far beyond him in magnifying the common possession of Lutherans, Calvinists and Catholics in the interest of ecclesiastical union. Such conduct naturally excited opposition from those who disliked Melanchthon, and had suffered from the casualties of the times. Hence Kurtz, in discussing the two parties and the two tendencies that arose after Luther's death, says: "The personal friends, scholars and adherents of Luther, on the contrary, for the most part more Lutheran than Luther himself, emulating the rugged decision of their great leader, and carrying it out in a one-sided manner, were anxious rather to emphasize and widen, as far as possible, the gulf that lay between them and their opponents, Reformed and Catholic alike, and to make any reconciliation and union by way of compromise impossible." *

Occasions and just grounds of controversy were not long in waiting. Soon a theological war broke out and spread over all Germany, but the chief battle-fields were the two Saxonies, Electoral under the Albertine and Ducal under the Ernestine line. Many were the questions of dispute and varied was the order of battle. Sometimes the chief disputants joined forces against a common enemy, and sometimes they turned their arms against each other in the deadliest hostility. But as the questions in dispute can be reduced to three chief points, so can the disputants be reduced to two chief parties. The chief points in dispute have to do mainly with the fundamentals of Anthropology, Christology and Soteriology; and the chief disputants may be aligned as Flacianists and Philippists. But before we can discuss these subjects further we must exhibit what were in part the expressions and in part the causes of the *Controversies within the Lutheran Church,* viz.:

* *Church History,* Eng. Trans., p. 350.

1. *The Corpora Doctrinæ.*

No confessional history of the Lutheran Church would be complete did it not contain an account of the different *corpora doctrinæ* which appeared in the different territorial Lutheran churches during the sixties and seventies of the sixteenth century. These were collections of doctrinal treatises introduced into different territorial churches at different times for the purpose of regulating the preaching and the theological teaching, and for the purpose of setting bounds to the vagaries of the theologians. These *corpora doctrinæ* all witness to the Lutheran faith of the Princes and of the churches that introduced them, but by no means in a *uniform* way. They indeed show a distracted rather than a unified Lutheran Church. They are themselves expressions of the distractions then existing in the Lutheran Church. At the same time they show a disposition to set forth a large number of doctrinal treatises as normative for the faith and the doctrine of each particular territorial Church; and just as distinctly do they show the presence of the party spirit, which in many places had changed Lutheranism into *Lutherism* and *Melanchthonism,* that is, had created one party who took "holy Luther" and his words as normative, and another party who took "the dear Master" and his words as normative. That each party made a perverse use of its authority in many instances, and drew false conclusions from premises, cannot be successfully denied. The Flacianists, the Jena School, represented the *extreme* of *Lutherism.* The Philippists, as they were nicknamed by their opponents, in some cases did violence to *Melanchthonism.* Of the preservation of the harmony that had existed between Luther and Melanchthon they did not dream. But no wonder! That was not an age of harmonizing, but an age of fighting. The Flacianists, following the example of Luther, fought aggressively. The Philippists fought in the main defensively, but some of them unduly magnified, and perverted, the Melanchthonian type of teaching.

But now to the *Corpora Doctrinæ* as illustrations of this preface.

1. *Corpus Doctrinæ Christianae.* That is, *a complete summary of the correct, true doctrine of the Holy Gospel according to the divine, prophetic, and apostolic Scriptures, very correctly, devoutly and Christianly brought together into a few books by the Venerable Master Philip Melanchthon.* Folio. 1560.

This book was a private enterprise. It was arranged by the

publisher and by Caspar Peucer, Melanchthon's son-in-law.* It was published at Leipzig by the learned printer, Magister Ernest Vögelin, with a preface by Melanchthon, dated September 29, 1559. Because it contains, besides the Ecumenical Creeds, only treatises by Melanchthon, it is usually called *Corpus Philippicum,* and after it was made normative for doctrine in Electoral Saxony in 1567, it has been frequently called *Corpus Misnicum,* in order to distinguish it from the *Corpus Thuringicum.* By reason of the great authority of Melanchthon it was made a norm for teaching in Hesse and in Pomerania already in 1561.

It is composed of the following treatises:

1. The Three Ecumenical Creeds.
2. The Augsburg Confession according to the edition of 1533.
3. The Apology of this Confession.
4. The Repetition of the Augsburg Confession, that is, the *Confessio Saxonica.*
5. The Chief Articles of Christian Doctrine in Latin called *Loci Theologici.*
6. The *Examen Ordinandorum.*
7. Refutation of the Idolatrous Articles set up by the Jesuits in Bavaria.
8. Against the Renewal of the Error of Servetus.

In the same year, 1560, this *Corpus* was published in folio in Latin, also by Vögelin, with a preface by Melanchthon, dated, February 16, 1560. The Latin edition contains exactly the parts found in the German edition, with the addition, at the end, of *The Response concerning the Controversies of Stancar.* The Augsburg Confession and the Apology appear in the edition of 1542, and, in accordance with the custom of the times, the Confession is declared to be that Confession delivered to the Emperor Charles V. at Augsburg, anno M. D. XXX., and is introduced with the Preface that introduces all the Latin editions of the Confession.

Melanchthon's prefaces to the *Corpus,* German and Latin, throw much light on the genesis of the Augsburg Confession. They should be read together, as each assists in understanding the other.

According to Feuerlin-Riederer, the *Corpus* passed through thirteen editions, seven Latin and six German. In the second and subsequent Latin editions the Augsburg Confession accord-

* Hutter, Cap. XI., f. 94. Buddeus, *Isagoge,* p. 493.

ing to the octavo edition of 1531, a little varied, was added to that of 1542, article by article. The last Latin edition was published at Strassburg in 1580, and the last German edition at Zerbst in 1588.*

It was according to the second and subsequent editions, not according to the first edition, that this Latin *Corpus* was authorized by the Saxon Estates.

2. The *Corpus Pomeranicum.* The title *Corpus Doctrinæ Christianae,* in which the true Christian doctrine is correctly and purely embraced according to the Content of the Holy Prophetical and Apostolical Scriptures, etc. This Corpus was adopted at a Synod held in Stettin, March 6, 1561. It contains the same parts that are embraced in the *Corpus Doctrinæ Philippicum,* but in the lower Saxon dialect. To this collection of Melanchthon's writings was added in 1564 a collection from the writings of Luther consisting of the two Catechisms, the Schmalkald Articles, several *Opinions* written by Luther, and Luther's Confession, first published in 1529 (Works Erl. Ed. 30: 363 *et segq.).* The two collections were published at Wittenberg in 1565 under the title: *Corpus Doctrinæ Christianae, in which the true doctrine,* etc. This Corpus was made symbolical for all the churches in Pomerania. In the years 1573 and 1593 each, it received an addition, chiefly from the writings of Luther, and also (1593) the Pomeranian Confession, drawn largely from the Formula of Concord.† Salig says that "the Pomeranian Church composed its *Corpus Doctrinæ* in the main according to the *Philippicum,* for the reason that it had subscribed the *Repetition of the Saxon Confession* intended for the Council of Trent, and because the Dukes of Pomerania had taken part in the Diet of Naumburg." ‡

3. *The Corpus of the City of Brunswick.* This has been designated as the first specifically Lutheran Confessional Book to bear the name *Corpus Doctrinæ.* In addition to the Preface, dated October 30, 1563, it contains the following parts: The Brunswick Church Order of 1528 (composed by Bugenhagen in *Plattdeutsch*) translated into high German in 1531; the Augsburg Confession ("according to the form in which it was deliv-

* For additional, and perhaps more accurate, information about the different editions of this *Corpus* than one finds in the Feuerlin-Riederer, see Realencyclopädie,[3] IV., p. 294.

† Baumgarten, *Erleuterungen,* p. 259 *et segq.*

‡ Vol. III., 704.

ered to the Roman Emperor in the year 1530 at Augsburg"); the Apology; the Schmalkald Articles (with Preface by Stoltz, 1554); the Lüneburg Articles, which had been subscribed by deputies of the Lower Saxon Cities at Lüneburg, August 27, 1561. In the Confession of the City of Brunswick, 1570, this collection of symobolical writings was again ratified as the *Corpus Doctrinæ* of Brunswick.*

4. *Corpus Prutenticum,* 1567. It bore the title: *Repetition of the Body of Church Doctrine,* or Repetition of the Sum and Substance of the true doctrine of the Catholic Christian Church, as the same is, according to God's Word, embraced in the Augsburg Confession, in the Apology and in the Schmalkald Articles. The *Repetition* was composed by Mörlin and Chemnitz, both of whom had been called from Brunswick to Königsberg for that purpose. It consists of a discussion of the chief articles of the Christian faith in forty-one and a half folia. May 28, 1567, it was subscribed by 86 theologians assembled at Königsberg. George Venediger, Bishop of Pomerania, heads the list and is followed immediately by Mörlin and Chemnitz.

The entire *Corpus* is introduced by the Preface, in which Margrave Albert of Brandenburg commands his preachers and teachers to accept it and to hold it, and to abide by it, "and not in the least to oppose it either in words or in works." Dated, Königsberg, June 9th, in the year 1567. The text of the Augsburg Confession agrees with that which had been taken into the Brunswick Church Order; † that of the Apology is the translation of Justus Jonas. The order: The Augsburg Confession, the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles, was followed in the Book of Concord, 1580.‡

5. *Corpus Thuringicum.* The title is: *Corpus Doctrinæ Christianae,* that is, a summary of Christian Doctrine composed from the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles, by Dr Martin Luther especially, and by other teachers of this land as the same . . . is unanimously confessed and taught. Printed at Jena by Christian Rhödinger's heirs. 1570, folio.

This Corpus embraces the three Ecumenical Creeds, Luther's Catechisms, the Augsburg Confession, Wittenberg edition of

* *Realencyclopädie,*[3] IV., p. 295. Rehtmeyer's *Braunschweig Kirchen-Historie,* III., 245 *et seqq.,* especially pp. 253-4. Baumgarten, *ut supra,* 265 *et seqq.*

† Salig, I., 705.

‡ For a lengthy account of this *Corpus* see Hartknoch. *Preussische Kirchen-Historie,* pp. 423 *et seqq.*

1531, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, the Thuringian Confession of 1549, delivered on account of the Interims, the Confutations of 1559 (see p. 300), and a short admonition to Confession. The same *Corpus* was printed in Latin at Jena in 1571. Here the Confession is given according to Melanchthon's octavo edition of 1531. The authors of this *Corpus* were the theologians of Ducal Saxony, who sent it forth in opposition to the *Corpus Philippicum,* which, at the Altenburg Colloquy, 1568-9, had been a subject of dispute.

6. *Corpus Brandenburgicum*, which appeared at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1572, in folio. The general title runs thus: *The Augsburg Confession from the Genuine Original which was delivered to the Emperor Charles V. at the Diet of Augsburg, anno 1530.* The Small Catechism. An Explanation and Short Extract from the Postils and doctrinal treatises of the Dear Man of God, Dr. Luther, from which it can be seen how the same taught in regard to the Chief Articles of our Christian Religion. The Augsburg Confession is given according to the copy brought by Coelestin in 1566 from Mayence, and which for a long time passed as and was called the "unaltered." But subsequent investigations have shown that it was made from an early unsigned manuscript, and consequently that it has no authentic value. The German text in the Book of Concord was made from the same manuscript, and is there exhibited as "that first unaltered Augsburg Confession," a mistake that has brought much confusion and bitter controversy into the Lutheran Church.*

This *Corpus*, together with the Agende attached to it, was made normative in the churches of the Electorate. The collection contained also Explanations of the Confession and of the Small Catechism, taken from the writings of Luther.†

7. *Corpus Wilhelminum,* that is, the Sum, Form and Type of the pure Christian Doctrine: The three Chief Symbols, the Augsburg Confession, octavo, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, Luther's two Catechisms. The form of doctrine, which has hitherto prevailed in the churches and schools of the Duchy of Lüneburg, shall in the future not be changed. The *Corpus* included the Tractate of Urban Regius on the chief *loci* of the Christian Doctrine, and another containing a number of brief sections on the principal doctrines, composed by Martin Chemnitz. This *Corpus* does not differ materially from that

* See Weber's *Kritische Geschichte,* I., 233 *et seqq.;* II., 119 *et seqq.*
† Weber, *ut supra,* II., 121.

composed by Chemnitz as chief author, in the year 1569, and is almost identical with the *Corpus Julium*, which was sent forth for Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, in the year 1576, printed at Heinrichstadt, folio.* This *Corpus* is still subscribed by the clergy of Brunswick.

8. *The Nürnberg Normal Book*, prepared in 1573 for the churches in Brandenburg, Ansbach and Nürnberg. It was an enlargement of the *Corpus Philippicum*, and contained the following twelve parts: The Three Ecumenical Creeds, Luther's Catechisms, the Augsburg Confession, "and especially also in connection with the later the first edition, Latin and German, which at Naumburg, in the year 1561, was rectified and subscribed by the Electors and Princes," the Apology, Schmalkald Articles, Repetition of the Augsburg Confession of 1551, *Loci Communes* (Strassburg Edition of 1523), Examen Ordinandorum, Theological Definitions, Reply to the Articles of the Bavarian Inquisition, Reply concerning the Controversy of Stancar, the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Church Order of 1533, together with Sermons on the Catechism for Children. In January, 1573, this book by decree was made *norma doctrinæ et Judicii* for Ansbach. March 30, 1573, it was authorized for Nürnberg, and remained in force for a long time.

In the year 1578 the clergy of Hohenlohe were required to subscribe about the same articles of faith and books of doctrine as those shown in the *Nürnberg Normal Book*.†

These *Corpora Doctrinæ* are an object-lesson. They show that the Lutherans were by no means united in matters confessional. Some inclined more to Luther and others to Melanchthon. The *Corpus Philippicum*, though not originally intended to be a *norma Judicii*, and the *Corpus Thuringicum*, composed in purposeful antithesis to the *Philippicum*, represent the extremes. The former, inasmuch as it contained only writings of Melanchthon, would naturally lead its subscribers to a one-sided development of the Melanchthonian type of doctrine, especially when exposed, as they were, to hard pressure from an extreme presentation of Lutherism as the same was exhibited in the *Corpus Thuringicum*, and as, beginning especially in 1558 at the formal opening of the University of Jena, it had been taught in

* Feuerlin-Riederer, pp. 7, 8. Baumgarten, *ut supra*, pp. 278 *et seqq.* Salig, I., 705-6.

† *Realencyclopädie*,[3] IV., 298. For additional information in regard to the *Corpora Doctrinae*, see Müller, *Die Symb. Bücher*, 7th ed., pp. cxxii. *et seqq.*

Ducal Saxony, where Matthias Flacius Illyricus was (1557-1561) the ruling spirit. Hence it may be said that during the sixth and seventh decades the Lutheran theology and the Lutheran Church were divided between Flacianism and Philippism, though the antagonisms and controversies, represented by these words, began more than a decade earlier.

2. *The Interims.*

Charles V. conceived it to be the chief mission of his life to bring back the religious dissidents of Germany to unity with the Catholic Church. But he could conceive of no basis of unity except that which existed in the doctrines, polity and usages of the Roman Catholic Church. He was hostile to the Council of Trent, as largely the creature of the Popes, and desired a free general council in consonance with the demands of the Protestants. In this he was opposed by the Popes, who did not want a council which was not subservient to their dictation. Though baffled and opposed by the Pope, Charles resolved to secure to the Church the fruits of his many victories in the Schmalkald War. Consequently at the Diet of Augsburg, which was opened September 1, 1547, he appointed (February, 1548) a committee to prepare norms of doctrine and usages which should be observed until a final decision could be rendered by a general council. About the middle of the following month the committee reported twenty-six articles, which were almost entirely Catholic in form and in conception. Among other things it is here taught that Justification is equivalent to *making righteous;* the Church is that which is governed by Bishops legitimated by the Apostolic succession, with power to explain the Scriptures, and subject to the successor of Peter; the Seven Sacraments are restored; the Mass as an appropriation and memorial of the merits of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross; the invocation of the saints; daily Masses in the cities; *Corpus Christi;* though the marriage of priests and giving the cup to the laity in communion were to be tolerated until the decision of the Council. These propositions were supported and finally accepted by Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg and Palsgrave Frederick II. Maurice of Saxony referred them to his theologians, Melanchthon, Major, Cruciger and Pfeffinger, who at Alt-Zella, early in April, 1548, emphatically rejected the teaching of the articles on Justification, on the invocation of the Saints and the Mass, but thought that some concessions might be made in regard to the doctrines of the Church

and of the Sacraments. May 15th the Interim, then called *Liber Augustanus,* was officially announced, and June 30th it became a law of the Empire. The Elector of Saxony protested, May 18th. The great majority of the Protestant Estates were opposed to the Interim, knowing that it was the death-knell of Protestantism, but only a few thought of opposing a public protest.* Melanchthon showed special opposition to this Augsburg Interim. He called it, "This sophistical book," and declared that it would be the cause of new wars and of greater alienations in the Church, said that he would not burden his conscience with it, and wrote to his friend Camerarius: "So long as I live I will act as I have hitherto done, and I shall speak the same things wherever I shall be. I shall continue the same worship of God and shall speak with my accustomed moderation, and without violence." † His conduct was all that could be reasonably expected of him in these perilous times.

But the more than half-apostate Maurice and some of his counsellors, especially Christopher von Carlowitz, who was acting in the pay of Charles, were intent upon close approximation to, if not reconciliation with, the Catholics. Accordingly, conventions of civil counsellors and theologians were summoned in July, August, October and November, respectively at Meissen, Pegau, Torgau and Zelle. The theologians persisted in their opposition to the civil counsellors who wished to enforce the Interim. Finally at Zelle, under the insistence, threats and sophistical argumentations of the civil authorities, joined with the reproach that they were disturbers of the peace, the theologians yielded to, rather than approved, the formula which was presented by the civil counsellors November 19th. "When they saw what they had done," says von Ranke, "they were amazed that they had allowed themselves to be led so far. They complained that they had been overwhelmed by the purposes of the lords. Their consolation was that all that they had conceded could be reconciled with the truth, and that this yoke was only taken upon themselves in order that they might not surrender the Church to desolation. And so much is certain, that though they yielded and followed, still they did not violate the Evangelical system in its essence. Many of these dogmas and ceremonies were such as Luther, at the beginning, had not wished to over-

* See Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus,* p. 6 *et seqq.* Möller, *Kircheng.,* 3d ed., III., 154 *et seqq. Realencyclopädie,*[3] Art. *Interim.*

† C. R. VI., 878.

throw. But what an immense difference between allowing the traditional to stand for a time, and the restoration of that which had been already abolished.'' *

This formula was ratified at Leipzig, December 21, 1548, and made a law for the Saxon Electorate. The Article of Justification is stated according to the Lutheran conception. Some of the other articles are capable of a Lutheran interpretation. But as a whole, the Article of Justification excepted, the Formula is decidedly *Catholicizing.* It restores nearly all the usages then current in the Roman Catholic Church, under the name of *Adiaphora,* that is, of things indifferent, which may be held without injury to Holy Scripture. Ordination is committed to the Bishops. *Corpus Christi* is revived. The Mass is ordered to be said essentially as in Roman Catholic churches. Confession and absolution are made obligatory in the sense that no one is allowed to receive the sacrament who has not first confessed to the priest and been absolved. In a word, except as above indicated, the document is almost a complete renunciation of the Reformation and of the Evangelical doctrine.† Hence:

That this new Formula, which was now imposed upon the Saxon churches—essentially a doing of the civil authorities—as a directory for teaching, preaching, administration and worship, should excite great commotion, is not to be wondered at. In a short time protests and letters of inquiry came to Wittenberg and to Leipzig from individual cities and Estates. Melanchthon became almost heartbroken. But he repented his sin and asked God for pardon, though he had never given an unqualified approval of the document. He simply regarded ''the transactions at Leipzig as tolerable'' in view of ''the perils that threatened the churches and the State.'' He ''wanted some things considered differently and done differently.'' ‡ His general attitude was that the Formula contains nothing that is *directly* contrary to sound doctrine, that the Church has not been abandoned, that the voice of truth has not been hushed, that some servitude must be borne, provided it can be done without committing ungodliness, that the Church must be saved from such desolation as had overtaken it in Swabia, where, in conse-

* *Deutsche Geschichte,* vol. 5, 57. See C. R. VII., 258-9 (Interim Lipsiense). *Realencyclopädie,*[2] VI., 777.

† Original in C. R. VII., 259 *et seqq.* English translation by Jacobs, *Book of Concord,* II., 260 *et seqq.*

‡ C. R. VII., 275-292. Von Ranke, vol. 5, pp. 58-60. Richard, *Philip Melanchthon,* 333 *et seqq.*

quence of the enforcement of the Augsburg Interim, four hundred pastors had been driven into banishment.*

"Unfortunate circumstance," exclaims von Ranke. Yes, "unfortunate circumstance," chiefly because it introduced the spirit of schism into the Lutheran Church, which has haunted it to this day.†

3. *Flacianism.*

Now it was that Flacianism arose. Matthias Flacius, often called Illyricus, was born at Albona in Istria, March 3, 1520. After receiving the rudiments of education at home, he studied for a time in Venice, and was about to enter the University of Padua or of Bologna to study theology with the intention of becoming a preacher, when his uncle, Baldo Lupetino, pointed him to Luther as a restorer of the Gospel, and sent him, in 1539, to Germany. He studied for awhile at Basel and then went to Tübingen.‡ In 1541 he made his way to Wittenberg, where he was warmly welcomed by both Luther and Melanchthon. He was already, or at least soon became, an adept in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. In 1544 he was appointed to the professorship of the Hebrew language in the University of Wittenberg. Very soon he made himself known by the productions of his pen. In 1548 he attacked the Augsburg Interim pseudonymously, and sought to cast discredit upon Melanchthon's leadership, though Melanchthon had firmly resisted that Interim. No sooner did the Leipzig Formula become known than he opened a combat against it, and against the Wittenbergers.§ He it was who called the Formula agreed upon at Leipzig, the *Leipzig Interim,* a name by which it is now almost universally known. The attack upon the Wittenbergers brought him into strained relations. About Easter (1549) he informed Melanchthon that for the sake of his health, and to escape the innovations, he would, for a time, leave Wittenberg.|| He went first to Magdeburg, then to Lüneburg, then to Hamburg, and then came back to Magdeburg, because here the press was free. Here he started afresh on a career of polemical activity, which in extent, in vigor, in bitterness, in calumniation, in persistence, has had no equal in the history of the Christian Church. His assaults on Mel-

* C. R. VII., 252.

† Nearly all the documents connected with the *Interims* are given by H. Th. Hergang in his *Das Augsburger Interim,* 1855.

‡ See Flacius's own account in *Vertheidigungsschrift,* reprinted in *Matthias Flacius Illyricus.* By Dr. A. Twesten, pp. 36 *et seqq.*

§ *Vertheidigungsschrift,* p. 41, and *Realencyclopädie,*[3] Art. *Flacius.*

|| Preger, *ut supra,* p. 74.

anchthon exhibit the instincts of a wild beast rather than the graces of a Christian man. Melanchthon charges him with inventing *manifesta mendacia.* Certain it is that he descended to the low expedient of publishing some of Luther's private letters —obtained either by theft or in confidence—to Melanchthon, for the purpose of contrasting the steadfastness of the former with the complacency of the latter. He made Luther—chiefly the polemical Luther—the Paragon, and thus set the pace for appeal to Luther—chiefly to the polemical Luther—as the final authority for doctrine. Indeed, he sometimes, and in some subjects, out-Luthered Luther, erected some of Luther's rhetorical utterances into premises and drew conclusions from which Luther—especially the later Luther—would have revolted. Thus we have *Flacianism,* which is a one-sided presentation of Lutherism intensified.

In judging of the motives which governed Flacius in leaving Wittenberg and in attacking the Leipzig Interim and the Wittenbergers with such fierce violence, historians do not agree. The reasons given by himself, namely, on account of his health and to escape the innovations, are not wholly satisfactory.* At Wittenberg it was charged that his hostility to Melanchthon arose from the fact that he was not given the professorship made vacant by the death of Cruciger, and this is declared by Melanchthon himself, who wrote to George Fabricius that they had nourished a real viper in their bosoms, and that he ought to have stigmata branded upon his forehead, such as the King of Macedon had branded upon a soldier: *Ungrateful Guest.*† In his conduct towards Melanchthon he was, to say the least, an *ungrateful guest.* That he was constrained also by conscience cannot be denied. But neither his conscience nor his methods can be approved, though the principle of heredity may account for both. He was not a German. He did not speak the German language. He could not enter into sympathy with Germanic conditions. He was a scion of that wild, lawless Illyrian stock, which for two thousand years had been a menace and a terror to its neighbors, both East and West. The blood of his forefathers coursed through his veins. It is in his hereditary disposition, doubtless.

* Preger, *ut supra,* p. 74.

† C. R. VII., 449. For Melanchthon's defense against the calumniations of Flacius and his *manifestum mendacium,* see C. R. VII., 477 *et seqq.;* also Richard's *Philip Melanchthon,* pp. 342 *et seqq.* See also Rossel's *Melanchthon und das Interim,* printed as *Beilage* to Twesten's *Matthias Flacius Illyricus,* and Ellinger, *Leben Melanchthons.*

that we are to seek for an explanation of the violence and recklessness of his conduct as a controversialist. He sought not so much to refute an opponent, as to annihilate an enemy. On the one hand his mind was bent towards the annihilation of Melanchthon's influence in the Church. On the other hand it was bent towards the erection of a Lutheran Church on the foundation of Luther's controversies with Rome and with the Zwinglians.

But notwithstanding the objections here raised to his animus and to his methods it is cheerfully conceded—and that on the principle of honor to whom honor—that Flacius rendered invaluable service in counteracting the Leipzig Interim and in reducing it to naught. He had and inculcated the correct idea of *Adiaphora,* namely, that as things neither commanded nor forbidden by the Divine Word, they may be tolerated and received in the exercise of Christian freedom, but they are not to be imposed by authority, nor forced upon the Church by a hostile power, nor made a test of soundness in the Christian faith. He also had the correct idea of the relation that the State should sustain to the Church, namely, that the former should not dictate the faith and the form of worship to the latter, but should protect the latter in her own proper sphere of teaching and preaching the Gospel.

At Magdeburg, Flacius found congenial companions in Nicholas Amsdorf, Erasmus Alber, Nicholas Gallus and others who had suffered more or less from the Schmalkald War. The coterie called themselves "exiles of God." Their literary activity was prodigious. Most of it—even in spirit and purpose the invaluable *Magdeburg Centuries*—was polemical, and much of it was directed against Leipzig and Wittenberg. In the year 1550 they published a confession of faith which they declare to be founded on the Prophetical and Apostolic Scriptures, and to be in harmony with the Augsburg Confession.* Soon they were engaged in strife against the proposition of George Major that good works are necessary to salvation, and against the doctrine of Osiander that men are justified by the infusion of the essential righteousness of Christ through faith, against the Mysticism of Schwenckfeld, and, by and by, against the doctrine of Free-will as it was taught at Leipzig and Wittenberg. But what made the ecclesiastical situation the more complicated and distressing was the political animosity existing between the two Saxon lines, of which we have already made frequent mention.

* Given in Hortleder, II., Bk. 7, 1053 *et seqq.*

Since the Partition of Leipzig in 1485, the Electorate had been in the Ernestine line, and the Duchy in the Albertine line. Ernest died in 1486 and was succeeded by his son, Frederick the Wise (1486-1525). He was succeeded by his brother, John (1525-1532), the enthusiastic friend of the Reformation and the head of the Schmalkald League. He was succeeded by his son, John Frederick. In Ducal Saxony Albert was succeeded by his son, George the Bearded (1500-1539), a zealous Roman Catholic and an ardent opponent of the Reformation. George was succeeded by his brother, Henry (1539-1541), who was a devoted Protestant. Henry was succeeded by his son, Maurice, also a Protestant, but a man who subordinated his religion to his political interests. In the Schmalkald War he joined the Emperor against his kinsman, the Elector of Saxony, who was captured at the battle of Mühlberg and condemned to death, though for political reasons the sentence was commuted to imprisonment. John Frederick bore his misfortune with Christian resignation, and asserted his adherence to the Protestant religion with heroic fortitude. His patience in affliction and his steadfastness as a confessor of Christ excited the sympathy and won the admiration of all good and true Lutherans. Soon he was regarded as a martyr, and justly so. He was witnessing a good confession.

After the capitulation of Wittenberg the Electoral dignity and a part of its lands were bestowed upon Maurice as the reward of his services to the Emperor. Thus the Electorate passed to the Albertine line, and the Ernestine line was reduced to the rank of dukes. Maurice was regarded—and justly so—as the betrayer of the faith of his father and of his people, and was called "the Judas of Meissen." Soon Roman Catholic prelates were reinstated in the three influential bishoprics of Meissen, Merseburg and Naumburg-Zeitz. Then came the Leipzig Interim which he and his courtiers forced upon the theologians, and which they tried to impose upon the churches of Electoral Saxony. It was but natural that the new Elector should be hated by all Lutherans; and it was but natural that the Ernestine Dukes should hate him, and that they should array themselves against him both in religion and in politics.

Very soon these Dukes, sons of the ex-Elector John Frederick, resolved to establish a university at Jena, and sought to place Melanchthon at the head of it. Melanchthon counseled against the proposition on the grounds that it would probably increase the hostility towards John Frederick and his family,

and that it would cost a great deal of money. "The Princes are poor and in debt." At the same time he insisted that Wittenberg was the place for the university, since the sciences and arts had flourished there.* But as the Weimar court insisted he sketched the plan for a new university, though he did not give a categorical promise to come to Jena. When he learned, July 18, 1547, that the theologians had been summoned to Leipzig by Maurice, and that a messenger had been sent to Weimar for him, he hastened to Leipzig. Here Maurice promised the theologians "that he would not allow any papal abuses to be introduced; nor would he tolerate anything contrary to the Word of God, but as a Christian Elector he would protect the Word of God and its ministers to the best of his ability." † Declining all other invitations, Melanchthon decided in favor of "the little nest on the Elbe," whither he traveled, July 25th, in company with the other theologians. Here it was his delight "to gather together the planks of the shipwrecked university."

But his decision to return to Wittenberg, not his theology, and his zeal in re-establishing the university under the patronage of Maurice, were construed by the Weimar court as an act of ingratitude towards his former lord. To this was added the charge, by those who had been driven from their places by the Schmalkald War, that Melanchthon meant to change the Lutheran doctrine, an allegation which Melanchthon denied again and again, and which he refuted absolutely by the *Confessio Saxonica,* composed in 1551, and by his repeated affirmations of adherence to the Augsburg Confession and to its Apology, though nothing that he could do or say satisfied either the Weimar court or the Magdeburg "exiles of God;" and the political animosity of the Dukes excited the feelings of the theologians and shaped their policy and their conduct in matters of religion.‡

Hence it was, with the view of asserting and of maintaining the Lutheran doctrine as they had conceived it, under such a frame of mind, and as it had been drilled into them by Amsdorf, and other Flacianists residing in their court, that these Dukes in 1558 erected the Jena Gymnasium into a university, and called thither Matthias Flacius Illyricus as Professor of Theology. Henceforth, except for a short interval, Jena was the stronghold

* Bindseil's *Supplementa,* p. 541.
† C. R. VI., 605.
‡ See Richard's *Philip Melanchthon,* pp. 320 *et seqq.*

of the Flacianist type of Lutheranism as against Leipzig and Wittenberg and the Melanchthon type. It soon became customary to speak of the theologians of Ducal Saxony and of the theologians of Electoral Saxony, or of the Ernestine and of the Albertine theologians. Such designations were understood to mean differences in doctrine and in tendency. From the very beginning of the new university (1558), the two classes were arrayed in theological strife against each other. Jena made an attack the day on which she was formally opened. The other side repelled the attack and made counter attacks. The one side became as polemical and as bitter as the other, and both sides were influenced by the jealousies and animosities entertained by their respective Princes.

The theologians of Ducal Saxony carried their disputes with Melanchthon and others to the Diet of Worms, September, 1557, and refused to take part in the colloquy with the Catholics, unless Melanchthon and other Lutheran theologians would agree to subscribe their catalogue of condemnations.* When this was refused the Ducal theologians withdrew, and the Diet was broken off, as the Catholics declined to recognize either party as the representatives of the Lutheran Church. The next year a number of Evangelical Princes, assembled at Frankfort on the Main, endeavored to put an end to the strife by the publication, March 18th, of a mild and considerate declaration, known as the *Frankfort Recess,* based on two essays, the one written by Melanchthon and the other by John Brentz.† This *Recess* was promptly rejected by John Frederick the Second, who in the following year set up the *Confutation Book,* which was made legally binding on the clergy and on the professors in the Duchy.‡ When Victorine Strigel and the venerable Pastor Hügel refused to subscribe it they were thrown into prison and brutally treated.§ Then came the Weimar Disputation, August, 1560, between Strigel and Flacius on Free-will and Original Sin.|| In 1558-9 a dispute arose at Heidelberg over the Lord's Supper. The Elector Frederick expelled the quarrelsome theologians and in reaction against Flacianist extremes

* Salig, III., 295. Planck, *Geschichte der Prot. Theol.,* VI., 129 *et seqq.*

† Gieseler, *Church History,* IV., 444, and note. The text of the *Frankfort Recess* is given in C. R. IX., 489 *et seqq.* It was signed by the three Electors, Otto Heinrich, Augustus, Joachim; by Palsgrave Wolfgang, Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, Philip Landgrave of Hesse.

‡ Gieseler, *Church History,* IV., 445.

§ Möller-Kawerau, III., 284. Planck, IV., 599, 600, and note 172.

|| Edidit Simon Musaeus, 1562, 1563.

brought in theologians who favored the Calvinistic view.* This and other events so enraged John Brentz, that at a Synod in Stuttgart, December 19, 1559, he procured the adoption of a *Confession* which not only reaffirmed the strict Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but included the doctrine of the absolute ubiquity of the body of Christ, based on the *communicatio idiomatum*.† From 1557 to 1562 a controversy over the Lord's Supper raged in Bremen, resulting in the acceptance, by the city, of the Calvinistic doctrine.‡

4. *Crypto-Calvinism.*

This controversy over the sacrament of the Lord's Supper soon became exceedingly violent in the Lutheran Church. In some places in Northern Germany and in Ducal Saxony some of the defenders of the strict Lutheran doctrine of the Supper went to the very verge of the Roman Catholic doctrine. The Philippists in Northern Germany and the Philippists in Electoral Saxony, who showed decided sympathy with the Calvinistic view, and in some instances held it, were stigmatized as Crypto-Calvinists. As the Flacianists had carried Luther's teaching of the Lord's Supper to an unjustifiable extreme in one direction, so did the Philippists carry Melanchthon's teaching on the subject to an equally unjustifiable extreme in the opposite direction. Neither side maintained the Luther-Melanchthon doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

For a time the Philippists succeeded in deceiving the Elector, who always meant to be a Lutheran and wished to preserve his land from the intrusion of Calvinism. In the presence of their Prince these men claimed to be Lutheran. In reality they favored the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper. This was shown in the Catechism which appeared at Wittenberg in 1571,§ which presented the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in language that may be regarded as a cross between Lutheranism and Calvinism. It declares that "the Son of God is truly and substantially present in the sumption," but it employs the word *cre-*

* Möller-Kawerau, III., 263. Gieseler, IV., 459.

† Möller-Kawerau, III., 263. Gieseler, IV., 451-2. The Confession is republished by Pfaff in *Acta et Scripta Publica Ecclesiae Wirtembergicae* (Tübingen, 1720), 334 *et seqq.*

‡ Möller-Kawerau, III., 264-5. Gieseler, IV., 456.

§ Catechisis continens explicationem simplicem et brevem Decalogi, Symboli apostolici, Orationis Dominicae, Doctrinae de Poenitentia et Sacramentis. Wittebergae, 1571. Walch, *Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten*, 4, 5, p. 69. Planck, V., 571-8. Gieseler, IV., 465, note 33.

dentibus where the Lutheran doctrine requires *vescentibus,* as in Article X. of the Augsburg Confession. This brought on a storm of dissent, not only from the Flacianists, but also from some divines in Lüneburg, Brunswick and other places.*

The Elector was quieted for a time by the *Dresden Consensus,* which was subscribed and presented at Dresden, October 10, 1571, and which treats of the Lord's Supper and of the Person and incarnation of Christ. But this *Consensus* failed to give satisfaction, especially to the zealots and to the advocates of the doctrine of ubiquity and of oral manducation. Beyond question, it contains ambiguities that bring it under suspicion of *Calvinizing.*†

But soon the crisis came. Upon the death of Duke John William of Saxony, March 3, 1573, Augustus took the guardianship of the young Princes and the regency of the Thuringian lands. Immediately he expelled Heshuss and Wigand from Jena, and drove away all the Flacianist clergy from the district. The Philippists now thought that their victory was complete, especially since during the year 1573 scarcely anything of importance had been published against them. They thought that now the time had come to make an open avowal of their Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

Accordingly, in January, 1574, appeared, without the name of the author or the place of publication, the *Exegesis Perspicua.*‡ It was subsequently ascertained that the author was Joachim Curaeus (died in 1573), a Silesian physician, who had interested himself in the study of theology. The publisher was Ernest Vögelin, of Leipzig. The booklet had been composed already in 1562, and had been privately circulated in manuscript. The paper, the types and other insignia employed by Vögelin pointed to Geneva as the place of publication. The treatise was secretly circulated in Wittenberg, and was sent to Heidelberg and to France. The Heidelbergers, and the Calvinists generally approved it. Its teaching on the Lord's Supper is decidedly Calvinistic. There could now be no question that Calvinism was abroad in the land. The Elector August was thrown into a vio-

* Walch, *Einleitung in die Streitigkeiten,* IV., 69 *et seqq.* Loescher, *Historia Motuum,* III., 144-147.

† Hutter, *Concordia Concors,* Cap. 3. Walch, *ut supra,* pp. 80 *et seqq.* *Planck,* 5, 589 *et seqq.* Gieseler, IV., 466-7.

‡ *Exegesis Perspicua et ferme Integra Controversiae de Sacra Coena, Scripta ut privatim Conscientias erudiat et Subjicitur Judicio Sociorum Confessionis Augustanae, Quicunque candide et sine privatis affectibus Judicaturi Sunt,* Anno Jesu Christi 1574. Republished by Scheffer, Marburg, 1853.

lent rage, and although the Wittenbergers had had nothing to do with the composition of the *Exegesis Perspicua,* yet they were accused of smuggling Calvinism into the Electorate. Caspar Peucer, Melanchthon's son-in-law, was thrown into prison, where he languished for twelve years. Chancellor Cracow was imprisoned and tortured, and left to die in prison. The Court preachers Stössel and Schütz were also imprisoned. The former died in prison, and the latter was not released till 1589.*

In May, 1574, a convention was held at Torgau, where articles on the Lord's Supper were composed, on the presupposition of agreement of Luther and Melanchthon. These articles are known as the Torgau Confession. There it is declared, "the foundation of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper are the words of Christ taken in their literal sense. In the Lord's Supper with the bread and wine the true and substantial body and the true and substantial blood of Christ are truly and substantially, though invisibly and in an inscrutable manner, administered and received." Transubstantiation is rejected, and also the errors of Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Martyr, and the theologians of Heidelberg. Oral manducation and the reception of the body and blood of Christ by the unworthy are affirmed. The doctrine of ubiquity was rejected.†

The four Wittenberg divines who refused to sign these articles were banished. Friedrich Widebram and Christopher Pezel went to Nassau, Heinrich Moller to Hamburg, Caspar Cruciger to Hessen. Thus Philippism went down in its own stronghold. But the Torgau Confession did not satisfy the Flacianist party. Wi-

* For a lengthy account of the Exegesis see Loescher, III., 163 *et seqq.* Heppe, *Geschichte,* II., Anhang, following p. 463. Hutter, *ut supra,* Cap. IV. Planck, 5, 2, 606 *et seqq.,* 631. Gieseler, IV., 468, and note 39. See Möller-Kawerau, III., 269. Calinich, *Kampf und Untergang des Melanchthonismus,* pp. 100-124.

† Gieseler, IV., 469, note 41; Möller-Kawerau, III., 269; Calinich, *ut supra,* pp. 151 *et seqq.,* 164-5. The Articles are given by Hutter, Cap. V. See Heppe, *Geschichte,* II., 432; Calinich, *ut supra,* 146 *et seqq.* To commemorate this triumph of Lutheranism the Elector August had a medal struck. On the one side stand the Elector himself and the Elector of Brandenburg, each with a book in his hand. Beneath them is the legend: CONSERVA APUD NOS VERBUM TUUM DOMINE. On the reverse side stands the Elector of Saxony, with bare head and pointed beard, in armor, upon a rock bearing the words: SCHLOSS HARTENFELS. In his right hand he holds a sword; in the left, a pair of scales. In the one scale sits the child Jesus, holding the world in his left hand, while the right hand points to a floating title on which is inscribed: DIE ALLMACHT. In the other scale lie the four Wittenberg theologians, Cruciger, Moller, Widebram and Pezel, with the devil and a superscription bearing the words: DIE VERNUNFT. Anton, *Geschichte der Concordienformel,* I., pp. 138-139.

gand, who was now Bishop of Pomesania in Prussia, wrote against it and raised the question whether the new professors who had been called to Wittenberg were better than those who had been expelled. Even Selneccer was displeased with the Confession.*

But happily for Lutheranism, there were many Lutherans in Germany who had attached themselves to neither extreme, though in Swabia, after 1559, the theologians were mostly Ubiquitarians, and many inclined toward that form of predestinarianism which had been expressed in Luther's earlier writings.† In Mecklenburg, in Pomerania and in parts of Lower Saxony, the theologians were warmly attached to Melanchthon, and acknowledged his merits and his great services to the Church. It was to the intermediates that the Elector of Saxony now attached himself.

* Heppe, *ut supra,* II., 440-1. Gieseler, IV., 469, note 42.
† For Brentz, see Hartman and Jäger, II., 400-406.

CHAPTER XX.

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY.

THE Lutheran Reformation of the sixteenth century proceeded from a profound sense of human need. Luther, in his cell at Erfurt, exclaiming: "My sin! My sin! Oh! my sin," voiced the sentiment of thousands of his countrymen. Sin was felt by them to be a great burden, which could be removed alone by divine grace. Hence Sin and Grace were regarded as the direct antitheses of each other. The one was held to be the corruption of all the moral and spiritual powers of man. The other was defined as the pure divine favor which is freely exercised in the unmerited forgiveness of sin. Basing their conclusions on the Augustinian doctrine of sin and grace, both Luther and Melanchthon referred the salvation of man to the Will of God. That is, at the beginning of the Reformation both Luther and Melanchthon were absolute predestinarians. They held that there is no such thing as free-will in man, and that God determines all things absolutely by his own will.

1. *As to Luther.*

In his *Assertion of All the Articles,** 1520, Luther declared that "Free-will (liberum arbitrium) after sin (that is, since sin entered the world) is a thing that exists in name only, and so long as it acts according to what it is in itself, it sins mortally," and that "Free-will without grace is not able not to sin." "Free-will is in reality a figment, or a name without reality, because it is not in its power to think anything evil or good, but all things are under God, against whom we can do nothing except in so far as he himself permits or does." Over against this absolute predestinarianism, or rather, determinism, Luther places the grace of God, by which alone men are saved.

In his book on *The Bondage of the Will (De Servo Arbitrio)* † written in the year 1525 against the *Diatribe on Free-will,* by Erasmus, he makes a clear distinction between the Will of God as it is in itself, inscrutable, and the Will of God as it is revealed

* Jena Edition of Works, II., 307 *et seqq.*
† Erlangen Ed. of Works, Latin, vol. 7.

in the Divine Word, or as he sometimes states it, between "the hidden God" and "the proclaimed God." With the former we have nothing to do. Our business is with the latter. According to the former, men are predestinated to death. According to the latter, all men are invited to be saved. But this distinction can be best presented in Luther's own language: "But why some are touched by the law and others are not touched, so that the former receive and the latter contain the offered grace is another question, and is not treated in this passage by Ezekiel, who speaks of the proclaimed and offered mercy of God, and not of that secret and awful will of God, who ordains by his own counsel whom and what kind of persons he wishes to become capable and participant of his proclaimed and offered mercy. This will of God is not the object of research, as it is by far the most venerable secret of the divine majesty, is reserved to himself alone and is prohibited to us more religiously than the Corycian caves to countless multitudes.

"When now *Diatribe* (Erasmus' book) captiously inquires whether the holy Lord bewails the death of his people, which he himself has wrought in them—for such a thing seems perfectly absurd—I reply as I have already done: We must argue in one way concerning God, or the will of God, proclaimed, revealed, offered to us, and made an object of worship, and in another way concerning God not revealed, not proclaimed, not offered, not made an object of worship. In so far, therefore, as God hides himself, and wills not to be known by us, he is nothing to us. For here holds good that motto: What is above us, is not for us," p. 221. Again:

"The will of God abandons and reprobates some purposely, that they may perish; but we must not inquire why he acts thus; but the God who has such power and wills such things must be reverenced." He also declares that nothing happens, mutably or contingently, but that "all things happen necessarily and immutably, if we have regard to the will of God. For the will of God is effective, and cannot be thwarted, since it is by nature the very potency of God." He carries this thought so far as to quote with approbation some of the most fatalistic passages from Virgil: "All things are fixed by law," "a day is appointed for everyone," "if thou canst break the terrible fates," p. 136. This is one side of Luther's doctrine of the divine will. That will is absolute in its determinations. It is the thunderbolt that annihilates free-will in man.

But there is another side. God reveals himself in his Word. This is "the proclaimed God." Over against this God, man has *voluntas,* the power of choice. This God is set forth before men in Christ. Hence the obligation of men in hearing the Gospel, and the responsibility of men in accepting or rejecting the offer of salvation. On this point Luther utters no uncertain sound: "Rightly, therefore, is it said: If God does not will death, it must be imputed to our will if we perish. Rightly I say, if you speak of the proclaimed God, for he wills that all men be saved, inasmuch as by the word of salvation he comes to all, and it is the fault of the will (voluntas), which does not admit him. How often would I have gathered thy children, but ye would not. Matt. 23," pp. 222-3. After quoting Colossians 2:3, he says: "Therefore the Incarnate God says here: I would, but thou wouldest not. The Incarnate God, I say, was sent into the world that he might will, might speak, might do, might suffer, might offer for all men all things that are necessary unto salvation," pp. 227-8. Again: "God does not work in us without us. He hath created and preserved us that he might work in us and that we might coöperate with him," p. 317. This is the other side. Hence we have Luther *versus* Luther, and hence the materials for controversy. Luther engaged in the contemplation of "the hidden God" is an absolute predestinationist. Luther engaged in the contemplation of "the proclaimed God" is a Christian universalist, and holds that it is the sincere will of God to save all men. But in constructing a system of Christian Anthropology, we have to do with Luther the Christian universalist, in whom there is not a trace of particularistic election. It is true that even this Luther denies that man has Free-will (*liberum arbitrium*), but he affirms that man has the power of choice, the *voluntas.* The *liberum arbitrium,* the power to merit salvation by works that please God, has been destroyed by sin; but the *voluntas,* the power to lay hold on salvation when it is offered by divine grace, remains, since "we act *volentes et lubentes* in accordance with the nature of the *voluntas,*" p. 157; and since "God does not work in us without us," p. 317. In other words: "Since God has taken my salvation away from my *arbitrium* and has laid hold of it with his own, and has promised to save not by my own work and running, but by his grace and mercy, I am at ease and certain that he, since he is faithful, will not lie to me, and, because he is powerful and great, no devils and no adversaries can overcome him, or can pluck me away from him," pp.

362-3. That is, salvation is wholly of grace, the human will can contribute nothing towards it; but when we speak of "the proclaimed God," "it must be imputed to our *voluntas* if we perish," p. 222.

But this book, *De Servo Arbitrio,* which is Luther's most important contribution to anthropology, is not easy to reconcile with itself. In the year 1595 the theological Faculty of Rostock declared that Luther spoke very Calvinistically in this book. The great majority of the Lutheran dogmaticians, including such men as Chemnitz, Gerhard, Calovius, Loescher, have excused the predestinarianism of the book on the ground that the light of evangelical knowledge had not yet fully dawned on Luther. Some few have declared that there is nothing erroneous in the book. It may not be difficult to justify each of these views, for each expresses a part of the truth. But this is certain: The older Luther became, the more did he drop his earlier predestinarianism into the background, and the more did he lay stress on the grace of God and on the means of grace, which offer salvation to all men—*in omnes, super omnes*—without partiality, and convey salvation to all who believe.*

The following view, expressed by Dr. F. A. Philippi, of Rostock (1882), accords well with the facts in the case: "The Reformation, which arose in opposition to the Romish semi-Pelagianism, and did not proceed accidentally from the Order of Augustine, in the doctrine of sin and grace naturally went back to the correct principles of Augustinism, to the complete bondage of the will through sin and to the alone-activity of divine grace in the work of conversion. At first the doctrine of predestination fell completely into the background. But when Erasmus, in his book, *De Libero Arbitrio,* directed his attack upon the vital principle of the Reformation, and sought to bring the Church of God to reject the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation, and to return to the Romish semi-Pelagianism, and in addition, treated the absolute predestination as a necessary consequence of the Augustinian doctrine of sin and grace, and held it up as a bugbear, then it was that Luther, for the purpose of securing the evangelical basis of salvation, made a truly gigantic attack in this theological dwarf, in his book, *De Servo Arbitrio,* and did not shrink from drawing also the inferences from his position, and he accepted with an over-bold defiance of faith on the one hand,

* See a much more elaborate discussion of this whole subject in *The Lutheran Quarterly,* 1905.

from the premise of the bondage of the will, the theological deduction of an unconditional predestination; and on the other hand, from the premise of the unconditional omnipotence and eternal foreknowledge, the speculative conclusion of the bondage of the will. But Luther merely accepted the position offered him by his antagonist, and, for the moment only, allowed himself to be carried by opposition beyond the goal. In reality he sought rather to establish a basis than to draw a conclusion. And afterwards, both in his doctrine of justification, and in the central position which it assumed for him, and in his doctrine of the means of grace, even then already, and as time went on, more and more, there was shown an irreconcilable opposition to the doctrine of absolute predestination, whereby the latter was bound to be overcome. Therefore, Luther not only never afterwards repeated this doctrine, but in reality taught the very opposite in his unequivocal proclamation of the universality of the divine grace, and of the all-sufficiency of the merits of Christ, and of the universal operation of the means of grace, and he even controverted that doctrine expressly as erroneous, and by his corrections took back his earlier utterances on that subject.'' *

In his later writings we find Luther turning more and more from the *voluntas beneplaciti,* the will of God's good pleasure, to the *voluntas signi,* the will of God's revelation in the divine Word, through which He treats with us according to our understanding, until finally, in his comment on Genesis 26:9 (1536-1545), after urging his hearers to leave ''the hidden God,'' and to know only the God proclaimed through Jesus Christ, the Word, the Sacraments, the ministry, ''which are bodily things, corporeal signs by which God reveals himself,'' he says: ''These things I have desired thus accurately and carefully to exhort and to teach, because after my death many will quote my words, and from these corroborate their own errors and dreams of every kind. Among other things I have written that all things are absolute and necessary, but at the same time I added that we must look upon the revealed God, as we sing in the Psalm: He is called Jesus Christ, the Lord Sabaoth, and there is no other God; Jesus Christ is Lord Sabaoth, nor is there any other God, etc. But all these passages they will omit, and they will seize upon only those about the hidden God. Therefore, you who now hear me are to remember that I have taught that we are not to inquire about the predestination of the hidden God, but that we are to rest in that

* Glaubenslehre, 2 ed., 4, 1, p. 37.

which is revealed through the call and through the ministry of the Word. There thou canst be certain of thy faith and salvation, and canst say: I believe in the Son of God, who hath said 'Whoso believeth in the Son hath eternal life' (John 3:36). Therefore in him there is no condemnation, nor wrath, but the good will of God the Father. These things I have earnestly stated elsewhere also in my books, and I now present them *viva voce*. Therefore I am without blame." *

In the Synergistic Controversy the Flacianists laid the preeminent stress on the predestinarian portions of Luther's earlier writings, on "the hidden God," on the *voluntas beneplaciti*, and ignored, either absolutely or relatively, the countervailing sections on the universality of grace, on "the proclaimed God," on the *voluntas signi*. This one-sidedness of presentation ran to the very borderland of fate and of Manichaeism.

2. *Melanchthon.*

In the first edition of the *Loci Communes*, that is, the treatise on the chief articles of the Christian Doctrine, Melanchthon gives expression to the most absolute predestinarianism, or necessitarianism, or determinism. Among other things, he says: "Since all things that occur, occur necessarily according to the predestination of God, there is no freedom of our will." "The Scriptures teach that all things occur necessarily." "The Scripture takes freedom from our will by the necessity of predestination." "Neither in external nor in internal operations is there any liberty, but all things occur according to the divine determination." † He even went so far as to say specifically that David's adultery, Paul's conversion and Judas's betrayal of Christ were predestinated. But already in the year 1524 he shows signs of dissatisfaction with the doctrine of predestination as it was taught at Wittenberg. In an Excursus to the Commentary on Colossians (1527) he asserts the natural and essential freedom of the will in the most unqualified terms, in that the will of man has power to choose things that belong to nature; but man needs the Holy Spirit to renew and to purify him before he can have spiritual affections and emotions. In the Articles which were to be used in reorganizing the churches of Saxony and in placing them on an evangelical foundation, known as the *Saxon Visitation Articles*, he declares that the will is free to do the

* *Commentary on Genesis*, Op. Lat., 6, pp. 290-300.
† C. R. 21: 87 *et seqq.*

works of the law, but "that spiritual righteousness must be accepted from above." In his *Annotations on the Epistle to the Romans* * (1529) he goes further, and says that "faith is not obtained without a struggle. In the entire course of life, we must contend with our unbelief and must arouse the sluggish conscience by the Word and by faith." It was while in this frame of mind, and with both eyes directed towards the historical teaching of the Church, that Melanchthon wrote the Article on Free-will (XVIII.) in the Augsburg Confession, in which it is taught "that to some extent man has freedom of will to lead a life outwardly honest, and to choose between things which reason comprehends; but without the grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit he is unable to become pleasing to God, or to fear God in the heart, or to believe in him, or to cast out of the heart innate evil," which is explained in the Apology "that the will directs the understanding so that it assents to the Word of God," and "faith is to will and to accept that which is offered in the promise."

The doctrine of Predestination and of Free-will, as the same had been taught in his own and in Luther's earlier writings, he had now abandoned, and he purposely refrained from placing an Article on Predestination in the Confession, lest it might bring inextricable confusion. To the doctrine of Free-will, as set forth in the Confession and in the Apology, he adhered to the end of his life, for to the end of his life he confessed and reconfessed the Confession and Apology. In the *Loci* of the second period (1535-1543) and of the third period (1543-1559) he made changes in the statement of the doctrine of the Free-will, but no change in the doctrine itself, and nobody found fault with his changes. Here he wrote in regard to conversion: "Three causes are conjoined: The Word, the Holy Spirit and the not wholly inactive (*non sane otiosa*), but resisting its own weakness," and said: "Only will, and God anticipates," and: "God draws, but draws him who is willing"; and in the latter edition he used the words "assenting to and not resisting the Word of God," and declared that "the Will is not a statue, and spiritual emotion is not impressed upon it as though it were a statue." Against this teaching no Lutheran voice was raised during the period. All alike subscribed the Confession and Apology—old and new editions—and all alike lauded and praised the *Loci,* which was passing into new editions, Latin and

* C. R. 15: 444.

German, more rapidly than the years changed. "In June, 1549, Flacius wrote Melanchthon: 'As little as I could wish my own destruction, so little do I wish that of your *Loci.*' And Tilemann Heshuss said, in an address: 'As in his commentaries on the Scriptures Philip has surpassed all other writers in the Church, so in his *Loci* has he surpassed himself.' Calvin seems to have been the only person who was not satisfied with Melanchthon's teaching on Predestination and Free-will." *

In 1559 Melanchthon wrote to his Elector: "During the lifetime of Luther and afterwards I rejected those *Stoic and Manichaean deliria* that Luther and others had written, namely, that the deeds, good and evil, in all men, good and evil, must occur as they do. It is evident that such speech is contrary to God's Word, is destructive of all discipline and is blasphemous toward God." And in order to show that in practice Luther had abandoned the absoluteness of his former theory of Predestination, he refers to his (Luther's) *Trostschriften* and letters, and says: "I and others in his presence have often heard him comfort others thus: You must hold to the promise, which is *universal,* and we must not exclude ourselves." †

In regard to sin, Melanchthon uttered no uncertain sound. In the *Loci* of the third period (1543-1559) he wrote thus of original sin: "The sin of origin is the want of original righteousness, that is, in those born of virile seed it is the loss of light in the mind, and the turning of the will away from God, and contumacy of heart, so that they are not able to obey the law of God. On account of this corruption, they are guilty, and are the children of wrath, that is, they are condemned of God, unless they shall have been pardoned. If anyone wishes to add that also they are born guilty on account of Adam's fall, I do not object." With Melanchthon, sin is not merely something negative. He describes it as an "act that fights against the law of God," that "makes guilty of eternal wrath." It is "enmity against God." It is described as "a disorder of all the appetites," as "ipsum vitium born with us." "In general sin is vitium perpetuum or factum fighting with the law of God." ‡ He also revives the old Augustinian idea of concupiscence as an active evil in man, and sets it over against the scholastic idea of concupiscence as a mere weakness in man, and not sin. The fact is, in some of his private

* Dr. Carl Schmidt, *Philipp Melanchthon,* p. 574.
† C. R. 9: 766-9.
‡ C. R. 21: 378; C. R. 12: 437.

writings Melanchthon defines and describes original sin in stronger and more positive terms than he defines and describes it either in the Confession or in the Apology.

Under the heading, *Of Actual Sins*, we read the following: "Original sin is, as I have said, darkness in the mind, aversion of the will from God, contumacy of heart against God. These evils are not called actions; but from these arise actual sins within and without: In the mind constant doubts and blasphemies; in the will security and neglect, distrust of God, admiration of self, preferring our own life and will to the command of God, and a greatly confused mass of vicious affections." In describing the seat of sin he says: "These innate evils, defects, and depraved inclinations, are not only in the body, but they are at the same time in the soul and in the body, namely, in the cognitive faculty, vanity, darkness, and doubts in regard to God. In the appetent faculty and in the heart there exist no good inclinations, nor the love of God, nor the fear of God, but there exist depraved inclinations, the improper love of ourselves, pride, many sinful appetites, that is, the entire man (totus homo), soul and body, since the Fall, has ceased to be the abode of God, and since God does not shine in man, there is in him darkness and manifold disorder." *

And in treating the subject of Free-will (*De Libero Arbitrio*) at Worms, in 1557, he wrote officially: "In regard to this subject our Article in the Confession delivered at Augsburg is full and clear, and it was not then rejected. And we judge that our explanation is profitable for discipline and for the Church when we speak of the liberty that remains in the Will, namely, that of regulating the external conduct, and that the Will of man without the Holy Spirit is not able to produce the internal affections commanded by God, such as the fear of God, faith, the love of God, constancy and strength in confession, chastity of heart, and like internal virtues, which are and are called the fruits of the Spirit. By means of this our distinction both the Pelagians and the Manichaeans are refuted, and discipline is confirmed, and at the same time the benefits of the Son of God, as promised in the Gospel, are shown.

"We say that the unregenerate ought and can regulate their external movements so that the external conduct can agree with the law of God. It is of external actions that it is said: *The law is given for the ungodly.* But we affirm that this external dis-

* From the *Explicatio Symboli Nicaeni* (1557), C. R., 23: 403.

cipline cannot satisfy the law of God, and it is not the righteousness that pleases God, nor does it merit the remission of sins, nor is it that by which a person is righteous before God, that is, is accepted, but for other reasons, of which we shall speak at the proper place, it is necessary." *

Thus by the year 1557, yea, even before that time, the Lutheran Church had already passed beyond its formative period. It was established. It had an organized and a legally recognized existence in the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. It had its distinctive Confessions, which had been officially affirmed and reaffirmed. It had commentaries on the Scriptures, and it had a handbook of theology (the *Loci Communes*), which had almost the authority of a confession of faith and was often called *opus sacrosanctum.* Its doctrine of *Anthropology* (Free-will and Sin) were as clearly defined and as universally accepted by its members as was its doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ as set forth in Article III. of the Confession. But in the doctrine of Free-will the harsh expressions employed by Luther in controversy do not appear. Luther did not make any part of the *De Servo Arbitrio,* nor any part of the Commentary on the ninetieth Psalm, confessional, nor is he known to have uttered one word of complaint when Melanchthon repudiated his own earlier Necessitarianism, and from 1527 on affirmed the essential freedom of man.

On the contrary, after the controversy with Erasmus, as is conceded, Luther modified his earlier views in the interest of practical Christianity. More and more he emphasized the *Deus Revelatus,* and the *Vocatio Universalis,* and the Article of Justification by Faith alone, so that in his riper and better years his theology is represented preëminently by the three principles just now named above. His earlier doctrine of Free-will is practically supplanted by what Melanchthon, in the interest of the ethical content of conversion and of the religious life, has taught on these subjects. His own earlier teaching on the subject of Free-will, as already shown, though not formally revoked by him, had been allowed to fall into the background—rather to be superseded by what Melanchthon taught from the chair and published in his many opinions and commentaries, and in his more formal treatises. And for proof of this, we have only to refer to official testimony given by his pupils in the Pomeranian Synod of 1578.

* C. R. 9: 339.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

and to a long letter written by David Chytraeus to the Wittenberg theologians in the year 1595.

The former testify as follows: "The *Opinion* of the coöperation of man's Free-will in spiritual things by his own natural powers, which Illyricus (Flacius) and his followers have, in a way that causes distrust, charged against Melanchthon's *Loci* and against the passage from Chrysostom: God draws, but draws him who is willing; and the passage from Melanchthon: In the struggle of conversion the human Will is not absolutely inactive, and which opinion is now presented in the revised Book of Concord, which has been laid before us for subscription—of such *Opinion* we never heard or saw a trace during the life-time of Luther. On the contrary, we heard and were taught, and by the Grace of God have taught others, that in conversion to God man's Free-will (*liberum arbitrium*) can and does do nothing, and can contribute nothing of itself or by itself to his conversion. But also that in conversion to God man is not absolutely like a block or a stone. But when, through the instrumentality of the Word of God, he is moved and drawn by the Holy Spirit, he then, as a rational being, has a movement in himself. By carnal wickedness he can oppose God. Or by the grace of the Holy Spirit, without whose grace man can do nothing by his natural powers, he can, by using his Will, submit to God and his Word, and can become obedient to the same, though there is much weakness in the flesh."

These pupils of Melanchthon further testify that the identical doctrine by Melanchthon in the *Loci* of 1542-4 had been taught them orally by Melanchthon, and that such doctrine had not only not been rejected by Luther, but had been approved by him in his discussion of the passage in Paul: "God wills all men to be saved," and in the Preface to the first volume of his Latin works. Also they say: "We have always found and read in the said books (the *Loci*) that Melanchthon steadfastly and with great earnestness and zeal taught in opposition to Pelagianism and the Papists, that man's Will without the grace of the Holy Spirit, by his own natural powers, can do nothing and can understand nothing in spiritual matters *neither by willing, nor by beginning, nor by doing,*" and "Melanchthon always laid down the fundamental principle: The Will without the Holy Spirit is not able to will, to begin or to effect the spiritual conduct which God requires." And in regard to the Augsburg Confession of 1540 they testify: "Luther himself, for more than six years before his death, had

seen this more fully explained changed edition, which in the year 1540 and subsequently was employed at the councils. Had he scented in it such corruption, and seduction, sacramentarianism, antinomian, papistical or Pelagian teaching, he would not have kept silent on the subject." *

And Chytraeus, who had been a pupil under Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg, in his letter to the Wittenberg theologians, after referring to Luther's earlier doctrine of Predestination and absolute necessity, and his denial of all contingency in human affairs, says: "These and many other like horrible things, which at that time was taught in your lecture-room as oracles, but which now are retained nowhere except in the schools of the Calvinists, Philip, our common Preceptor, gradually toned down and removed, whilst in all his treatises on theology, ethics, physics, and dialectics, he refutes those absurd opinions, as he calls them, about the Stoic and Manichaean Necessity, and explains clearly in regard to the powers of Free-will, both what they can do alone, and what they cannot do except they be converted and changed by the Holy Spirit, and the passages of Scripture quoted by Luther in the beginning of his career for the purpose of establishing the divine Predestination or the Manichaean or Stoic Necessity, he explains very differently, and everywhere he refutes the principal arguments, and that, too, while Luther was still living. And especially did he execrate the affirmations of some that there are contradictory wills in God, one of the revealed God, another of the hidden God." †

The same is also affirmed by Planck, who says: "He (Luther) shows most unquestionably that he was conscious of a change, since he looked on in silence while Melanchthon was propounding the new theory under his eyes, and never once winked a sign of disapproval.

"Now we need scarcely ask in addition how the other theologians of the Protestant party may have felt in view of this theory. Unquestionably, Melanchthon's had become the prevalent one, since in all the schools of the party theology was taught according to his Hand-Book (the *Loci*). Indeed, very many accepted it from him without knowing or caring that they had been led away from Luther's theory, since it required more pene-

* These quotations have all been taken from original documents, given by J. H. Balthaser in *Andere Sammlung zur Pommerischen Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 116 *et seqq.* See *The Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1907, pp. 309 *et seqq.*

† *Dav. Chytraei Epistolae*, pp. 1267 *et seqq.* *The Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1905, pp. 330 *et seqq.*

tration and learning than we may suppose most of them to have had, to comprehend the difference between the two theories. There may have been many who still clung wholly to the genuine Augustinian theory as it had been impressed upon them by the writings and teachings of Luther, but they were very little troubled about Melanchthon's having set up or wishing to set up another." *

3. *Public Transactions.*

And as proof demonstrative that the Wittenberg and Leipzig teaching on Free-will had not excited the antagonism of the Flacianist party, we note the following personal and official transactions:

1. In the year 1556 Flacius sought "to effect a friendly agreement in *causa adiaphoristica* between the Wittenberg and Leipzig theologians and those who had written against them." To this end, he sent to Wittenberg thirteen "mild propositions," as he styled his articles of reconciliation.† These propositions call for the common condemnation of the Pope as Antichrist, of the Council of Trent, of the *Augsburg Interim*,‡ of the errors of the Anabaptists, of Zwingli, Major, Schwenckfeld, Osiander, and asks for union on the basis of the Augsburg Confession—of course, the *Variata*, for only that was then in vogue—"as a brief statement of the fundamental difference between the papal and Lutheran religions." But in these articles not one word is said on the subject of Free-will. Nor is there the remotest intimation that the doctrine of Free-will as the same had stood in the *Loci* for more than twenty years, and as it had been stated in the *Confessio Saxonica* and in Melanchthon's numerous treatises, was to be considered, or was in any sense in the purview. Proof positive this that the Wittenberg and Leipzig teaching on the subject of Free-will had not yet been catalogued as a heresy by Flacius.

2. In January, 1557, at the instance of Flacius and other Magdeburg theologians, the Superintendents, respectively, of Lübeck, Hamburg, Lüneburg and Brunswick, each attended by one of his clergy, suddenly appeared at Wittenberg with eight articles of reconciliation, prepared in the main by Flacius himself, and offered themselves as "Mediators" between the Magde-

* *Geschichte der Entstehung*, etc., 4: 566. The reader will not fail to observe the perfect agreement between Chytraeus and Planck on the main subject, viz., that Melanchthon had changed the whole course of doctrinal development on Anthropology.

† Given by Preger in *Matthias Flacius Illyricus*, II., 9-11.

‡ Melanchthon had violently opposed the *Augsburg Interim*. See above, p. 321, and Richard's *Philip Melanchthon*, pp. 329 *et seqq.*

burg and Wittenberg theologians. These articles, known as the Coswig Articles, demand agreement in doctrine according to the Augsburg Confession and the Schmalkald Articles, and name the several errors and corruptions that are to be rejected. But the subject of Free-will is neither named nor alluded to.

The eight articles were subsequently revised and enlarged; more errors and errorists to be rejected were named, but not one word is said about the Wittenberg teaching on Free-will. Moreover, in the documents relating to these negotiations, consisting of letters and explanations, as given in the Melanchthon *Corpus Reformatorum*, IX., 23-72, there is no intimation that Free-will has been or is a subject of dispute between the parties. Also in the Magdeburg Confession,* written by Flacius, and reaffirmed in the eight articles mentioned above as still the faith of the Magdeburgers, not one word of objection is found to any Melanchthonian teaching on Free-will, nor is any reference made to the definition of Free-will that had been introduced into the *Loci* in 1548.† The irresistible conclusion, then, from the premises is

*Found in Hortleder, II., Bk. 4, Cap. 5. Sixteen folio pages. Written in 1550.

† In the year 1548 Melanchthon, after discussing the subject of conversion, in opposition to the "frenzies of the Manichaeans," and in refutation of the Enthusiasts, who "imagine that there is no need of the ministry of the Gospel," says: "Know that God wills to convert us in this very manner, when, aroused by the promise, we struggle with ourselves, pray and resist our distrust and other vicious affections.

"Therefore some ancients have spoken thus: *Liberum arbitrium in homine facultatem esse applicandi se ad gratiam, id est, audit promissionem et assentiri conatur et abiicit peccata contra conscientiam.*" C. R. XXI., 659. When the controversy on Free-will had begun, the enemies of Melanchthon asserted that Melanchthon had taken this definition from Erasmus, in the sense of Erasmus, which sense Luther had powerfully refused. *Acta Disput. Vinar.*, 1563, p. 370. But the Erasmian and the Melanchthonian definitions are not identical, either in words or in meaning. Erasmus's *verba ipsissima* are as follows: Porro *Liberum Arbitrium* hoc loco sentimus vim humanae voluntatis quo se possit homo applicare ad ea quae perducant ad aeternam salutem, aut ab iisdem avertere. *Opera* IX., *De Libero Arbitrio*, p. 1215 *et seqq.* Luther's interpretation of Erasmus's definition is: "Free-will, according to Erasmus, is the power of the Will which is able of itself to will or not to will the word and work of God" (Erl. ed. *Var. Arg.*, 7: 191-2), which is not the meaning of Erasmus, much less is it the meaning of Melanchthon in his doctrine of *Liberum Arbitrium*.

When Melanchthon's friends asked him about this definition at the Diet of Worms, in 1557, he replied that it must be read in connection with the three preceding lines, that is, it must be applied to the *Arbitrium Liberatum*, an explanation which satisfied all. See Frank, *Die Theologie der Concordienformel*, I., 135, 198; Herrlinger, *Theologie Melanchthons*, p. 92; *The Lutheran Quarterly* for January, 1904, pp. 23, 24, 30. Even Jacob Andreae was satisfied with this explanation, though he thought the definition was ambiguous. Gieseler says, that when Melanchthon's friends asked him about this definition at Worms, he "satisfied them by the declaration that he meant *voluntas renata.*" *Church History*, IV., p. 444. Even Selneccer, after reciting Melanchthon's answer to Brentz, says: "*In hoc*

that if agreement could have been reached on the basis of the things named in the eight articles, the article of Free-will, as the same had been presented in the Confession and Apology, and as it had been more fully elaborated in the *Loci*, would have been satisfactory to Flacius and his Magdeburg fellow-Lutherans. And now for the documentary proof of this.

3. Scarcely had the Superintendents of the Lower Saxon cities left Wittenberg, than two commissioners arrived from the Duke of Mecklenburg, bearing a *Formula of Pacification*, which had been prepared at the request of Flacius, who for a long time had been importuning the Duke to act the part of mediator between him and Melanchthon. These articles, eight in number, treat of Doctrine in General, of God and Christ, of Justification, of the Necessity of Good Works, of the Lord's Supper, of the Efficacy of the Word, of the Freedom of the Human Will, of Adiaphora. Of Doctrine in General, the *Formula* says: "This with honest heart we embrace in that sense which is begotten by the various parts of the Scripture when compared with each other, and which is expressed in the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Augsburg Confession, the Confession and Catechism of the Reverend Dr. Luther, and in Philip's *Loci Communes*." * Here we see Melanchthon's *Loci* catalogued and placed side by side with the Augsburg Confession and with the Confession and Catechism of Luther. There is no mistaking the significance of this fact in the premises before us. Hence there is no need of comment, especially in view of the fact that when the *Formula* comes to speak of the Will it asserts the essential freedom of the Will, and its natural ability *in civilibus*, in language almost identical with that found in the

responso Brentius acquievit. Tom. III., 206-7. In his *Recitationes Aliquot* (1582) he says that in this definition Melanchthon declared that "he meant to speak *de libero arbitrio liberato, sive hominis renati.*" P. 331. In his teaching on Free-will Melanchthon never taught that the *initiative* or the *causal efficiency* is from man, but alone from the Holy Spirit through the Divine Word. It is the Will that has *begun to be liberated* that strives to assent to the Divine Promise. Herrlinger, *Theologie Melanchthons*, p. 92. Even Selnecker, in his vindication of Melanchthon and in explication of his teaching *de libero arbitrio*, declares: Tres sunt causae conversionis, etc. sed non pares aut aequales, aut simul efficientes, aut synergae: Una tantum est efficiens causa, Spiritus sanctus, secunda est instrumentalis, Verbum et Sacramenta. Tertia est subjectum, in quod per verbum motu suo, operatione et efficacia liberrime agit Spiritus sanctus. *Recitationes Aliquot*, p. 331. Dated, Leipzig, July 16, 1581.

* See the *Formula* in C. R. IX., 92-103. See Schütz, *Vita Dav. Chytraei.* Salig, III., 251. The Wittenbergers believed that Flacius himself had written the *Formula.* Flacius says that he had only in a general way requested articles of mediation, but that he did not know how the Duke had taken up the matter. Preger, II., 60, *note.*

works of Melanchthon; and then it says: "Fourthly, in spiritual actions, in the knowledge of God, in faith, in worship, in patience, it is certain that the human Will cannot by its own powers will or do anything except God himself precede by his Word, and by the divine afflatus moving and influencing wills so that they assent and obey. Fifthly, after this moving and influencing of the Will has been made from above, the Will of man is not absolutely passive, but, moved and assisted by the Holy Spirit, it does not resist, it assents, it obeys God and *sunergos esti,* as Paul says: When Joseph retains the grace of God and abstains from his Master's wife, his will is not absolutely passive, but, incited and assisted by the Holy Spirit, he resists the temptation, and restrains his external members. When David heard the consolation, *The Lord hath removed thy sins,* his will was not absolutely inactive, but it assented, and resisted distrust and doubt and struggled with itself.

"This simple and true doctrine *de synergia* of the human Will we embrace with consenting minds as the same is set forth in the *Locus de Libero Arbitrio,* and elsewhere by ours." *

The Ducal *Formula* was rejected by Melanchthon, because for him to have accepted it as a whole would have been for him to have cut his throat, as he wrote the Duke. But the commissioners, now leaving Wittenberg, went, as they had been instructed to do, to Magdeburg, and there placed the *Formula* before Flacius and Wigand, who replied the next day, in writing, that "they would have accepted the *Formula,* had it been accepted by the other party," meaning Melanchthon and the other Wittenbergers.†

Nothing that Melanchthon ever published is so out-and-out "synergistic" as are the three paragraphs quoted above from the Ducal *Formula Pacificationis,* and yet Flacius and Wigand were willing to sign the *Formula,* as the Duke of Mecklenburg had signed it with his own hand,‡ after it had been composed at his command by the theological Faculty of Rostock together with the civil counsellors,§ by which transaction it became a Confession of the Mecklenburg Lutheran Church!

* C. R. IX., 100-101. These articles are dated: Calend. Feb. Anno. 1557. Hence the reference to the *Loci* includes the edition of 1548 and its successors.

† Report of the Ducal commissioners. C. R. IX., 106-8. Preger, II., 60, note, refers to and employs this Report. Dr. Carl Schmidt notes the fact reported, and says: "The articles on the Lord's Supper and Free-will hold fast to Melanchthon's way of teaching." *Philipp Melanchthon,* p. 599.

‡ C. R. IX., 103. Salig, III., 251.

§ Schütz, *Vita Dav. Chytraei,* I., 150. Preger, II., 60.

4. At the Diet in Worms, in 1557, the Flacianists ask all the Lutheran theologians present to join them in "the rejection of all sects and false doctrines *in specie* and by name, as those of Zwingli, Osiander, Major, the Adiaphorists and others." * But in the long *Protestatio* not one word is said about any false teaching on Free-will among the Lutherans. And that this was not accidental is shown by the fact that when Strigel, who had signed the *Protestatio* at Worms, inquired again and again in the Weimar Disputation, August, 1560, why silence had been so long maintained on this subject of Free-will, and why it had not been brought up at Worms and included in the *Protestatio,* he was answered never a word.† Proof positive this that Melanchthon's doctrine of Free-will had not become a *quaestio vexata* in the Lutheran Church, and that even at Jena, where Flacius was at that time, it was not called "a heresy," as afterwards it was called by the Flacianists. At that very time Strigel, who had been a student at Wittenberg, was teaching the Melanchthon doctrine of Free-will at Jena.

After the Jena-Weimar theologians had withdrawn from Worms, because the other Lutheran theologians present would not join them in their *Protestatio,* the Lutheran theologians remaining at Worms, and representing churches from Pomerania to Würtemberg and Strassburg, united in a *Declaratio,*‡ in which they set forth that they do not change the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, and will not change it, and that there is among them no difference in regard to the doctrine of the Confession; and both Brentz and Melanchthon testify that there is absolute harmony between them *in doctrina et dogmatibus.*§

Now, bringing together the facts covering the period from 1527 to the close of 1557, we find:

1. That beginning with the year 1527, Melanchthon materially modified the harsh doctrine of Free-will, which earlier had been oracularly taught by himself and Luther in the University of Wittenberg.

2. That Luther is not known to have expressed himself in

* C. R. IX., 285.

† *Acta Disput. Vinar.* (1563), p. 38. Strigel said: Miror me hac materia sic urgeri, cum ante tres annos Vuormaciae nulla sit facta hujus controversiae mentio, cum de aliis multa severa mandata traderentur.

‡ C. R. IX., 389 *et seqq.*

§ C. R. IX. 311; 319; 452; 457. Pressel's *Anecdota Brentiana,* p. 443. It was here at Worms that Melanchthon confessed himself to the Augsburg Confession, the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles. C. R. IX. 365 *et seqq.*

opposition to Melanchthon's later teaching on the subject of Free-will. That on the contrary, by his unbroken silence, in regard to Melanchthon's teaching on this subject, and by his repeated sweeping endorsement and praise of the *Loci*—even the later editions—he practically placed his *imprimatur* on that teaching.

3. That Melanchthon knew himself to be in practical harmony with Luther in regard to Predestination and Free-will.

4. That Melanchthon's *Loci*, and consequently his doctrine of Free-will, was taught in all the German Universities that had received the Reformation; and that the theologians had accepted it or had at least acquiesced in it. (See on a preceding page the words of approval expressed by Flacius and Heshuss).

5. That the doctrine of Free-will played no part among the Lutheran theologians in the transactions at Worms in 1557, as it had played no part in the peace negotiations between Flacius and Melanchthon, except in the Mecklenburg *Formula Pacificationis* as noted above.

6. That Melanchthon taught that the Will is free *in civilibus*, but that *in spiritualibus* it is absolutely unable by its natural powers to do anything acceptable to God.

7. That Melanchthon taught that the Will, when assisted and urged by the Holy Spirit acting through the Word, can assent to the promise of Christ and can resist its own infirmity. Though such assent and resistance have absolutely no justifying merit, and are in no sense a ground of pardon, since we are justified by faith alone, "for the sake of Christ."

8. That in setting forth the doctrine of Conversion, Melanchthon begins with the Divine Word as the instrumental cause, and then proceeds to the Holy Spirit, whom he names "the efficient cause," and ends with the Will, which is a cause only when and only in so far as it is potentiated and moved by the divine efficiency.

9. That in the older confessional teaching of the Lutheran Church, and in the *Loci* of Melanchthon (1535-1543, 1543-1559) which had almost the authority and influence of a confession of faith, it is neither said nor intimated nor implied, that in conversion and in conceiving faith, man is *absolutely passive*, nor is it said nor intimated that in relation to conversion, man is a *block*, a *stone*, yea, "is much worse than a stone."

These nine propositions sum up the Lutheran teaching on *Anthropology*, from the year 1527 to the close of the year 1557,

though in the year 1550, when Melanchthon sent some theses to Pfeffinger of Leipzig on Free-will, or rather on the proposition that God does not operate with man as with a clod,* Flacius attacked him, and a certain Flacianist republished, either at Magdeburg or at Jena, an edition of the *Loci* of 1522, in order to set the author in contradiction with himself,† thus showing that Flacius and others who regarded themselves as Lutherans, were absolute determinists. Melanchthon published no reply to "the stoics," as he called those men, "who are now trying to revive the absurdities about Fate." though he had intended to make reply.

4. *The Controversy on Free-will.*

By Free-will (*Liberum Arbitrium*) is meant, according to Melanchthon, "the Mind and the Will conjoined." ‡ Generally the controversy on this subject is called the *Synergistic Controversy,* but as *Synergism, Synergists, Synergistic,* are terms of reproach invented by Flacius and his followers, it is not fair to the other side to use them in describing this controversy, especially as the other side, the Philippists, repudiated the essential things which the Flacianists charged in their use of these words, namely, that in conversion, according to the Philippists, the Will is an "efficient cause," and that by its own native power it can assent to the promise and can coöperate with divine grace.

The controversy came about in the following manner: In the year 1555, Dr. John Pfeffinger, Professor of Theology in Leipzig, published a small book entitled: *Quaestiones Quinque, de Libertate Voluntatis Humanae, propositae in disputatione ordinaria.* In the first question he asks whether there is liberty in the human Will to perform external righteousness, such as to abstain from murder, theft, and the like crimes. He answers the question in the affirmative. He then says: "When it is asked whether and to what extent the Will is able to obey the law of God, let it be replied truly and without qualification that human nature is not able to satisfy the law of God, because of the depravity born in us, since the law of God requires not only external obedience, but also internal cleanness and purity of heart, and complete and perfect obedience.

"It is certain that men do not have the freedom to get rid of this depravity that is born with us, just as they do not have

* C. R. IX. 555. Salig, I., 648.

† C. R. XXI. 70.

‡ C. R. XXI. 653. "Vocantur autem liberum arbitrium Mens et Voluntas conjunctae."

the power to get rid of death.'' To substantiate this proposition, he appeals to Romans 8, and to the words of Christ: ''Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind.'' He then continues: ''When inquiry is made about spiritual actions, it is rightly answered that the human Will does not have such liberty as to be able to perform spiritual deeds without the assistance of the Holy Spirit''—[Which is the very language of the Augsburg Confession, Article XVIII.].

''We must not resist the Holy Spirit when he moves our minds, but we must assent to him. For in this way the Holy Spirit is accepted by those who seek, that is, by those who do not spurn, do not resist, but with groaning seek assistance. In Acts it is said: He gave the Holy Spirit to them who obey him.''

Then, while on the one hand Pfeffinger declares that the virtues which agree with the law of God cannot be performed without the assistance of the Holy Spirit, he affirms on the other hand: ''Nevertheless, the Will is not inactive, nor is it like a statue, but three acting causes concur, the Holy Spirit, who operates through the Word of God, the mind thinking, and the Will not resisting, but in some sense obeying the Holy Spirit, now operating, and by earnestly seeking the assistance of God, as is said in Mark 9: Lord, I believe.

''Hence, some assent or apprehension on our part must concur, when now the Holy Spirit shall have illumined the mind, the Will, the heart. Hence, Basil says: Only will, and God anticipates. And Chrysostom: He draws, but he draws only him who is willing. And Augustine says: He assists those who receive the gift of the call with becoming piety, and as far as in man lies, conserve the gift of God. And again: When grace precedes, the Will follows.''

Then Pfeffinger denies that the Will is like a stone, a statue, and declares that it is not inactive in conversion. ''If the Will were inactive, there would be no difference between the pious and the impious, or between the elect and the damned, between a Saul and a David, between a Judas and a Paul.

''Some persons vociferate that the assistance of the Holy Spirit is weakened and diminished if even the least bit be attributed to the human Will. Though this argument may appear specious and plausible, yet pious minds know that by this our doctrine, according to which we allow some *synergia* to our Will, that is, some assent, some apprehension, absolutely nothing is taken away from the assistance of the Holy Spirit. We affirm that the first

parts must be given and attributed to Him, since he first and primarily through the Word or the voice of the Gospel, moves hearts to believe, to whom we ought to assent, as far as in us lies, and we ought not to resist the Holy Spirit, but we ought to submit to the Word, as Christ says: Whosoever hath heard of the Father, and learned, cometh to me, etc. Nor does our doctrine contain anything opposed to the words of Paul: Faith is the gift of God. For we are justified, not on account of our quality or worthiness, but for the sake of the merit of Christ, which we lay hold on by faith, which faith or confidence the Spirit kindles in us when we do not resist, but consent and try to obey."

We thus see that Pfeffinger teaches a doctrine of Free-will that harmonizes perfectly with the teaching of Melanchthon on the same subject, and so confident is he of such harmony, that he directs those who desire further information on the subject to Melanchthon's *Loci.* That is, Pfeffinger, like Melanchthon attributes no *causa efficiens,* no *causa meritoria,* to the action of the human Will in attaining salvation; nor is it said, nor intimated, nor implied anywhere in his *Quaestiones Quinque* that man, by his own natural powers, assents to the Word of God, but his teaching, both by expression and by implication, is that man has the power to assent only when he is moved and assisted by the Holy Spirit. And in no sense does Pfeffinger attribute the *initiative* to the human Will, nor does he even use the word *cooperate.* His distinct teaching is that man is justified by faith for the sake of Christ, whose merit is sieged by faith, which is the gift of God.

Pfeffinger also taught in this tractate, in full harmony with Melanchthon, that "the promise of grace is universal," that "all the saved are chosen for the sake of Christ," that "the cause of election and of justification is the same," namely, "the mercy of God reconciled by Christ, who was made an offering and a propitiation for the sins of the human race."

It will thus be seen that there is not one word that justified the allegation that Pfeffinger taught, that man by his own natural powers can prepare himself for the gift of the Holy Spirit, or that by his own natural powers he can coöperate in his conversion, or is able to work spiritual righteousness. But now, at the beginning of the year 1558, when the Jena Gymnasium was about to be erected into a university,* in the interest of a reactionary

* Gieseler, *Church History,* IV., 443: "As if for the consecration of the New Jena University."

Lutheranism, Nicholas von Amsdorf sent forth his *Public Confession of the Pure Doctrine of the Gospel and Confutation of the Fanatics of the Present Time.**

In this Confession the author avows his firm adherence to the Augsburg Confession, the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles, and condemns the Schwenkfeldians, the Osiandrians, Sacramentarians, the Adiaphorists, and the proposition that good works are necessary to salvation; saying, finally: "In addition to these five, there are yet some articles, as those of Dr. Pfeffinger and his faction, who teach and contend that man by the natural powers of his Free-will can fit and prepare himself for grace, so that the Holy Spirit shall be given him, just as the Sophists, Thomas, Scotus and others have taught. For in his disputations on Free-will, which he delivered two years ago, he concluded such absolutely shameless and absurd teaching with about the following words: Man by his natural powers is able to assent to the Word, to embrace the promise and to cease resistance to the Holy Spirit. Therefore we must not resist the Spirit, but assent to him when he moves our minds and hearts. For in this way the Holy Spirit is given to those who do not resist him. Haec ille, si recte memini."

Then, after giving his own interpretation and refutation of the alleged words of Pfeffinger, he says: "To the Devil with such sophistry. Pious Christians should not be hounded by it. Some people act towards us as though we were nothing but clods and blocks."

Pfeffinger promptly replied in a small book bearing the title: *Demonstratio Manifesti Mendacii.* As a part of his refutation of Amsdorf's mendacity he republished his *Quaestiones Quinque* without the change of a word, and denounces Amsdorf's method of quotation: Haec ille, si recte memini, as "an atrocious accusation and a capital crime, because, by a word he would cut the throat of a brother for whom Christ died." He not only repudiates Amsdorf's false quotation, but he repudiates the doctrine which Amsdorf had attributed to him. He not only states in the most positive manner that because of innate sin human nature cannot satisfy the law of God, but also: "In regard to spiritual things man is not so free or so strong by himself that he can of himself awaken or excite a truly spiritual thought or inclination to spiritual deeds, to say nothing about perfecting or completing the same. But the Holy Spirit must precede us

* Printed in Jena by Thomas Rebart.

in everything, must awaken and excite the heart, mind and spirit to good works, which is properly laying the first stone. But when the Holy Spirit does this, then we must not resist him, but must obey, and call upon God, and pray that He will give us His Holy Spirit, which then indeed is done, as it is written, Acts 5: 'God has given the Holy Spirit to them that obey Him.' And again: The Holy Spirit precedes the Will of man and excites it. The Will of man must not resist the Holy Spirit, but must follow Him; and in his weakness he must call upon God for grace and assistance that he may be redeemed and saved." He closes by declaring that his teaching on this subject is in harmony with the Apostles', the Nicene, the Athanasian Creeds, and with the Augsburg Confession, the Apology and the Schmalkald Articles.

Thus Pfeffinger's reply contains not only a denial of Amsdorf's allegations, but a complete refutation of Amsdorf's *manifestum mendacium,* that is, his falsification of what was taught in Pfeffinger's *Quaestiones Quinque.*

But this was only the beginning of the controversy on Free-will. Amsdorf replied to Pfeffinger the next year, and declared, among other things equally absurd, that "when God justifies a man he acts precisely as a carver does when he makes a statue out of wood. Out of a sinner who loves sin, God makes a man righteous and holy without any participation on the part of man. As stone and wood are in the presence of the artist, so is the Will of man in the presence of God." * That is, man is absolutely passive in his conversion. But meanwhile Flacius, who was now professor of theology at Jena, entered the lists and carried the fight into the schools, and "accused the entire University of Wittenberg of error." He affirms in his *Refutation of Pfeffinger's Propositions on Free-will,*† that in conversion man is not only absolutely passive, but that "toward God, by whom he is made a new creature, he is as a block is toward the statuary, and in conversion holds himself *adversativè, vel repugnativè seu hostiliter* towards the operation of God." In the same year also he held a disputation on Free-will in Jena for two days. He declares that in conversion we are "absolutely passive" and are "only as subjectum patiens," and that "we only bear or suffer the good bestowed by God, are renewed, fashioned, and, like a broken vessel,

* Thomasius, *Dogmengeschichte,* 2d ed., II., 498. Schmid-Hauck, *Dogmengeschichte,* p. 381.

† *Acta Disput. Vinar.,* ed. Musaeus, 1563.

are repaired by our potter," and "we are purè repugnativè towards the Spirit and the Word of God." "In regard to spiritual actions man is absolutely passive." "The person who is to be converted holds himself toward God much worse than does the clay toward the potter, or the stone or the block toward the statuary. For the artist chooses only good and suitable material, such as permits itself to be conveniently molded and shaped. But we are the worst kind of material. We lust against the Spirit and resist our architect." He also attacks Melanchthon's *Loci* in general, and especially the definition: *Liberum Arbitrium in homine,* etc. (see p. 346); says that "the synergists install absolute heathen theology, and corrupt not only this one article of Christian doctrine, but also that of original sin, of justification, of renovation, of new obedience," and calls the Wittenbergers scholastics.*

But lying back of Amsdorf's and Flacius's doctrine of Free-will is their doctrine of absolute predestination. The former says: "God has only one mode of acting with all creatures. For he acts only through his own *velle* and *nolle,* whether he do that through external means, or without means, as is said: *He spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast.* Therefore he acts with man also by his own *velle* and *nolle* and *dicere.* For *the will of man and the heart of the King are in the hand of God, and he inclines them as he will.* Wherefore God acts with man willing and understanding, in the same manner as he does with all other creatures, with a stone and a block, solely by his own *velle* and *dicere.* . . . As stones and blocks are in the power of God, so also in the same way the will and the understanding of man are in the will of God, so that man is able to will and choose absolutely nothing, except as God wills and speaks, whether by grace or by wrath, leaving him in his own counsel, as is written: "I have let them go according to the desires of their own hearts." He also holds the doctrine of particularistic election, or of determination on the part of God who shall believe or who shall not believe: "When God speaks and wills, then man, by the ministry of the Word, is converted, becomes pious and righteous. When God wills and speaks, then man believes the Gospel and is saved: Because *God has mercy on whom he will, and the Spirit operates where and when he will."* †

* *Acta Disput. Vinar.,* pp. 272 *et seqq., passim.*

† *Sententia Nicolai Ambsdorfii,* in Schlüsselburg, *Catalogus Haereticorum* V., pp. 546 *et seqq.* Pressel, *N. Amsdorf,* pp. 134-140.

Flacius expressed himself somewhat cautiously and denied that there are contradictory wills in God. Nevertheless, when pressed, he declared that there was nothing objectionable in Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio.* In his *Clavis Scripturae,* under the words *Praedestino* and *Praedestinatio,* he also expressed himself cautiously. In the *Weimar Disputation* he declared that it was in part due to the secret judgment of God, that all are not called, and that the light of faith is not kindled in all hearts. Frank calls him unqualifiedly: *Prädestinatianer,** and Planck says that "he avowed the entire Augustinian system of Predestination." † Thomasius holds that his theory leads directly to Predestination and *gratia particularis.*‡ Dorner says that he was an absolute predestinarian.§ Certain it is that after the Weimar Colloquy the Flacianists expressed themselves openly for the doctrine of Predestination. Wigand denied the universality of the divine election and call, and taught *gratia particularis.* Heshuss declares that "God does not will that all men shall be saved, for God does not elect all, or draw all by his grace"; he also says that "man is absolutely passive and is a block as regards spiritual actions." ||

In general, it may be said that the Flacianist party canonize Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* and make that book and certain extracts from Luther's writings normative and final in the premises, and charge it as a capital defect that their opponents have not followed the *De Servo Arbitrio.* They also heap reproaches upon their opponents and call them opprobrious names, such as Synergists, Adiaphorists, Erasmians, Pelagians, Hypocrites, Sophists, Sacrilegious, Church Robbers, Philosophico-Theologians, Corrupters of Luther's books, Disturbers of the Church, and others equally unjust and offensive. In a word, it must in justice to the facts be said that the Flacianists carried on a campaign of slander and defamation against their opponents, and proclaimed themselves the teachers and defenders of the pure Lutheran doctrine.

And now the Flacianist doctrine of Free-will was given a symbolical statement in the *Confutation-Book* of 1559 (see p. 328). Here it is declared: "We flee also and detest the dogma

* *Theologie der Concordienformel,* IV., 404. See p. 252.
† *Geschichte,* IV., 703-7.
‡ Dogmengeschichte, II., 507.
§ Dorner, *Hist. Prot. Theol.,* I., 372, note. Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte,* Vierte Auflage, pp. 900, 901.
|| See Schlüsselburg. V., 216, 228, 316 *et seqq.* Luthardt, *Die Lehre vom Freien Willen,* 240 *et seqq.*

of those who sophistically argue that the mind and will of man are coöperative, or are a concurring and coöperating cause in conversion and renewal." This their doctrine, they say, is contained in the Augsburg Confession, in the Apology and in the Schmalkald Articles. In other words, the Flacianists interpret the confessions in this article according to their views of absolute predestination as their fundamental starting point derived from an overstrained interpretation of the *De Servo Arbitrio,* drawing conclusions from that book which even Luther himself shrank from drawing; whereas it is an undeniable fact that Melanchthon had abandoned both his own and Luther's earlier views of Free-will and Predestination some years before he wrote the Augsburg Confession and the Apology.

5. *The Weimar Disputation.*

The Weimar *Confutation-Book* brought on a crisis. Victorine Strigel refused to sign "the Areopagitic Book." When Duke John Frederick heard of this, he appeared suddenly in Jena with some of his counsellors and summoned the theologians to an interview in the castle. Here Strigel and Flacius violently quarreled. The former called the latter the architect of a new theology, sycophant, an enemy of the Augsburg Confession. The latter kept the Weimar court apprised of all that the former did and said. And now, when the aged Pastor Andrew Hügel refused to read and explain the *Confutation-Book* from the pulpit, and Strigel persisted in refusing to sign it, they were both violently arrested at two o'clock in the morning, March 27, 1559, thrown into prison and inhumanly treated.*

At length, upon the intercession of influential Princes, Strigel was released from prison and sent home, but upon the condition that he was not to leave his house until he had answered the accusations which had been brought against him. And now when he had been under arrest at home for a long time, the Flacianists, "perceiving that errors could not be properly extirpated by the violence of the material sword, earnestly im-

* Schlüsselburg, XIII., 837. Salig, III., 481, 482, 587. Otto, *De Victorino Strigelio,* pp. 13, 45-47. For a tolerably full account of the arrest, imprisonment and cruel treatment of Strigel and Hügel, see Voigt, *Briefwechsel der berühmtesten Gelehrten,* etc., pp. 579 *et seqq.* It was a brutal procedure, and justly excited the indignation of the people and of many Princes. Flacius claims that the arrest was made without his counsel or knowledge. Schlüsselburg, XIII., 837. Nevertheless, it was accomplished by his machinations. Otto, *ut supra,* 49. Salig, III., 481. Voigt, *ut supra,* 579, 580.

portuned the Duke to permit a public disputation," in order that the matters in dispute might be viewed in the light of the Word of God.*

Accordingly, August 2-8, 1560, a disputation was held at Weimar in the presence of the Saxon Dukes, their counsellors, superintendents, pastors and many students who had come from the Universities of Leipzig, Wittenberg and Jena.

Of the disputants it may be said that Strigel was analytical in the turn of his mind, was thoroughly trained in classical literature, and was a master in the philosophy of Aristotle. Naturally, then, his treatment of the subject in hand would bear something of an ethical character. Flacius was deficient in classical culture and despised philosophy. Naturally, then, his disputation would be dogmatic in character. As a result of the difference in mental characteristics and in equipment, the two naturally drifted farther and farther apart in debate.

Each laid down certain propositions which he meant to defend in the disputation. In substance those of Flacius were as follows: The natural man by the power of Free-will is not able to do anything in his conversion, or to coöperate with the Holy Spirit; corrupt man is, in a spiritual sense, absolutely dead. In intellect, will and affections corrupt man "has been transformed into the image of Satan, is stamped with his character and is utterly infected with poison." "God alone in infinite mercy through the Word, the sacraments and the Holy Spirit converts, draws, illumines man, gives faith, justifies, renews . . . cuts off the stony adamantine heart." Even after conversion, in so far as we are flesh or are not regenerated, we resist God and his will. The papistical synergy of the human Will in man's conversions so persistently asserted by Strigel in opposition to the *Confutation-Book,* can in no sense be tolerated. Much less is to be tolerated the doctrine of Bernard, advocated by Strigel, that liberty *ex necessitate agendi,* remains complete in fallen man.

The following in substance are the Propositions of Strigel: "He deeply deplores the sad and lamentable depravity of human nature, and abhors the blasphemies of Pelagius and the like. He recognizes with grateful heart the necessary and salutary benefits which God, through and for the sake of Jesus Christ, bestows on human nature, which is not unlike a traveler

* Schlüsselburg, XIII., 837-8. Otto, *ut supra,* 13, 14, 51, 52. Planck, IV., 599 *et seqq.,* 604, note 181.

who has been despoiled and wounded by robbers. Man by his natural powers, without the Son of God, the Gospel and the Holy Spirit, cannot begin true and saving conversion to God. So long as the will resists, there can be no conversion. The voice of the Son of God makes man willing to submit. Therefore in conversion these three things concur: The Holy Spirit who moves the heart by the divine Word, and the Word of God made the subject of reflection, either when it is heard, or is read, or in pious meditation, and the Will of man which in some sense, through fear and trembling, assents to the Divine Word, and at the same time seeks assistance from him who says: 'Come unto me all ye who are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest.'" This doctrine is supported by many passages of Scripture. This doctrine, though the subject of much controversy, is in harmony with the Augsburg Confession and with the sounder writers of antiquity.

The disputation was opened by Flacius. His principal contention was that by the Fall, man has lost all power for good, and on the contrary has acquired the very worst powers and is born only unto evil. "The image of God created in man has been driven out by the true and lively image of the devil. Man in consequence of the Fall is not only wounded, but is absolutely dead, extinguished, killed, as regards good in spiritual things." "Since the Scripture calls man dead, evil by nature, I inquire whether he is not a block as regards the good." He denies that sin is an accident, and declares that Luther distinctly denies that it is an accident. He affirms that sin is the substance of man. In conversion there is no synergy on the part of man, but in conversion man is absolutely passive. In conversion the Will of man raves and gnashes. Conversion is a momentary act.

The principal contention of Strigel was that sin is an accident in man, that he has been deeply wounded by sin, that in conversion the Will is active only after it has been incited by the Holy Spirit. "The Holy Spirit moves hearts to assent." "The Will assisted by the Holy Spirit is able in some sense to assent." He declares that "the efficient cause of conversion is God." "God draws, converts. The Will does not draw itself, but is drawn by the Word." "The Will when it begins to be converted is not inactive." He maintains that to will belongs to the Will, but to will that which is good is of the Holy Spirit, and that in conversion there is an order of cause and effect. He refuses to limit conversion to a particular moment of time.

The difference between the two contentions narrows itself down to this: Strigel by his doctrine of the essential freedom of the Will provides in man a point of contact for the operation of the Holy Spirit through the Word. Flacius by his doctrine of sin as a corruption of the essence of man, and by his doctrine of the purely passive condition of man in conversion, his likeness to a stone, or block, disallows any real point of contact and presents a purely mechanical conception of doctrine. Thus the fundamental principles being so different, reconciliation would be impossible. Hence the Disputation closed without any decisive consequence, except that Strigel was restored to his professorship in which he continued to teach essentially as he had expressed himself in the Disputation. It may be that for the moment he did not lay sufficient weight on the doctrine of original sin, but he was neither a Pelagian nor a semi-Pelagian. His merit is that he maintained what can never be successfully denied, namely, that there is a personal and a psychological element in conversion. The error of Flacius is simply monstrous, in that it makes sin the very substance of man, and reduces conversion to a purely natural change in man.*

6. *The Controversy on Free-will Continued.*

In March, 1562, Strigel made what is known as his third *Declaration on Free-will.* In this Declaration Strigel "plainly and clearly confessed that by Free-will he understood in harmony with Augustine the Will itself, and that this Will, after the Fall, retains freedom from necessity and compulsion. Otherwise there would be no Will remaining. That God in and by conversion does not take away the Will, but changes it and makes it better, and begins and perfects the good in it, though he does not apply power, but out of an unwilling man makes one willing. The Will is *passive* in so far as God alone works all good, but *active* in so far as the Will in its conversion must be present and must consent and not resist, but accept." †

The Würtemberg theologians, Jacob Andreae and Christopher Binder, who had come to Weimar to examine Strigel's *Declaration,* asked the author to make a few explanations, and

* See *Disputatio de Originali Peccato et Libero Arbitrio,* etc., etc. Edidit Simon Musaeus, 1562 (1563). Salig, III., 587 *et seqq.* Thomasius, *Dogmengeschichte,* II., 498 *et seqq.* Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte,* II., 355 *et seqq.* Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte,* Vierte Auflage, pp. 900-902.

† Salig, III., 882.

when these were made, they expressed themselves entirely satisfied with the *Declaration,* and signed it.

This *Declaration* affirms that man has no *efficacia* or power by which he can think or will the things acceptable to God. Such *efficacia* and power are the gift and work of God. But as regards *modus agendi,* or aptitude and capacity, man differs from all things which are not endowed with Mind and Will. Men are susceptible of the divine call, and by the Holy Spirit can assent to the Word of God and can guard the precious treasure. Its position is supported by appeal to Gregory Nazianzen, to St. Bernard's *Tractate on Grace and Free-will,* and takes almost the entire second part from John Brentz's *Apology,* which had appeared in the year 1556. It does not contain a word that speaks of man as like a stone or a block, or as absolutely passive in conversion. But it sums up the whole matter in these words: "Wherefore the human Will after the Fall, considered with reference to the power of doing, is the slave and captive of Satan. But if you consider the aptitude, it is not a stone, or a block, but it has been divinely created so as to be susceptible of the heavenly gifts of the Holy Spirit." *

And yet this *Declaration,* which does not contain a trace of Pelagianism, which does not in any sense attribute conversion to the natural powers of man, or assign assent to the native Free-will in man, and which was approved by such orthodox theologians as the Würtembergers were supposed to be, and which in its more important and essential features was drawn from St. Bernard and Brentz, did not satisfy the Flacianists. On the contrary it only intensified the strife and widened the breach between the Flacianist and the Philippists. The commotion excited by it is thus described by Salig: "It (Strigel's Declaration) was a new apple of discord flung among the Thuringian clergy, some of whom had signed it at Weimar, as we have already said. The Würtemberg theologians, as mediators, had declared it correct and orthodox. The Court was entirely satisfied with it, and if it be regarded as to its fundamental principles, it is Christian and Scriptural, and to-day no theologian would teach differently from Strigel. Let the reader turn back to the reflections made by us on the Weimar Colloquy. The situation was extremely awkward. The Flacian-

* The *Declaration* in Latin is given by Schlüsselburg, V., 88-91; Otto, *ut supra,* pp. 59-61. German in Salig, III., 884-6. English in *The Lutheran Quarterly,* Oct., 1905, pp. 454-6. See in same a more extended account of this controversy.

ist pastors, about sixty in number, could not chide the Würtembergers with being synergists; and yet they preached and declaimed throughout the land from the pulpits against Strigel's *Declaration*, and told the people that man in conversion is like a block, a log, and is converted like a swine in spite of himself, *repugnativè*.* And in order to place their cause in the more favorable light they declared that they stood on Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*, and that what it contained they accepted to the last letter (which is done by very few Lutherans to-day), and that the party that accepted Strigel's *Declaration* were Erasmians and Pelagians. They charged the Duke and his counsellors and the Würtembergers with driving Luther's doctrine into exile. They sought help from the exiled theologians, who faithfully assisted them, and they had spies in all Thuringia who reported to them all that transpired in the country, as can be seen by the original documents which are often quoted in the *Acta*. Wigand and Judex, who were then at Magdeburg, came out with a criticism of Strigel's Declaration almost as soon as they saw it. Then followed Dr. Heshuss, the Mansfeld ministers, Nicholas von Amsdorf, Nicholas Gallus, Flacius at Regensburg, and others, who—some from misunderstanding, and others from party-feeling, because they thought that such great men as Flacius, Musaeus, Wigand, Judex, could not be mistaken, or regarded it as a piece of unnecessary strife—rejected Strigel's *Declaration*, or regarded it as obscure, ambiguous, heretical and contrary to Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*.

"When after long years we look at these polemical tractates, we are amazed to see how the people fought like blindfold gladiators, and how their hearts, embittered against each other and enraged, would not listen to reason, nor look at the matter aright, nor by explaining terms and by learning the truth, come to an agreement in a Christian and fraternal manner, not by disputing on metaphysical questions, but by apprehending the sole operation of God's grace and the power of the Holy Spirit in true conversion and regeneration. Of the two parties one was necessarily right, because in things that are contradictory it was thought that they stood in antagonism to each other. The Würtembergers were orthodox, and the exiled theologians announced themselves as extra-orthodox. And yet the Würtembergers had declared that Strigel's *Declaration* accorded with the Augsburg Confession, with the Schmalkald Articles and

* Musaeus, *Acta Disput. Vinar.*, pp. 2, 382 *et passim*.

even with the Saxon Confutation. What conclusion can we now come to in regard to the matter, other than that the people did not know what they were fighting about, and that the Flacians wantonly urged on these ungodly contentions from a quarrelsome disposition and from an insolent spirit?" *

As early as August twentieth (1562) the Mansfeld Ministers published a statement in which they say that the proposition of the whole case, that which the Holy Scripture and the Holy Luther lay down, is this: "In conversion man is absolutely passive and in no sense whatever coöperates by his own powers with Divine Grace." They say further: "Man contributes not more in his conversion than an infant in its mother's womb contributes to its own formation." "He is *subjectum mere patiens;* has no *modus agendi*" and "can do no more in conversion than a block." And to give authority to their affirmations they say: "This doctrine is handed down by the Holy man Luther and is firmly established in the Scriptures." They also allege it as a special fault that Strigel's *Declaration* makes no mention of the *De Servo Arbitrio,* which is to be accepted as the standard of teaching on the subject of Free-will.†

And Dr. Heshuss in his *Confutation of the Arguments by which the Synergists strive to defend their Error in regard to the Powers of the Dead Free-will,*† declared that man is *subjectum patiens,* and is absolutely passive in conversion and is like a block, and only suffers. "He does not assent, nor embrace, nor believe, but resists so long as he is not converted, regenerated, and changed by the Holy Spirit." "Man only suffers." "The Will is causa materialis, subjecta et patiens." "Subjectivum passivum." "Man is absolutely passive, and is a block as regards spiritual actions." "Mind and Will are the material in which, or *subjectum patiens,* in the operation of the Holy Spirit." † He makes the usual appeal to Luther as to a final authority in the matter of dispute, and he brings in the "Synergists" for their customary share of misrepresentation.

We now go back a little and then forward. In the year 1561 the Flacianists, Musaeus, Judex, Wigand and Flacius were

* Salig, III., 887 *et seqq.* The author gives in an elaborate note the documentary proof of his narrative and the grounds for his conclusions. See Otto, *ut supra,* pp. 65, 66; Walch, *Einleitung,* 4 and 6, pp. 100-101.

† Schlüsselburg, V., 315 *et seqq., passim.*

dismissed from Jena, as already noted, on account of their turbulent spirit, and because of their resistance of the Duke's Caesaropapism.* Their places were filled with men of Melanchthonian views, Freihub, Salmuth and Selneccer, in 1565.† There was peace now between the theologians of the different Saxon universities. But when Duke John William took the government in 1567, the Philippists were dismissed, and the Flacianists (not Flacius himself) were reinstated. Thereupon war broke out afresh. Soon Jena was in arms against Leipzig and Wittenberg. In the years 1568-9 a colloquy was held at Altenburg. In this colloquy and in the *Endlicher Bericht* the theologians and superintendents of Electoral Saxony planted themselves squarely on the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, and on the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum,* and maintained unequivocally that Free-will by its native powers can contribute nothing whatever to man's conversion and justification, but at the same time they declare that Free-will is not a block or a stone, that in conversion man is not absolutely passive, as the Flacianists so persistently taught.

In March (1569) the theologians of Ducal Saxony, headed by John Wigand, presented a Confession, in which, almost at the very beginning, they say: "We embrace the doctrine and the view of Dr. Luther, the Elias of these last days, as they have been transmitted most luminously and skillfully in the *De Servo Arbitrio* against Erasmus, in the Commentary on Genesis and in other books, and we judge that Luther's view harmonizes with the everlasting *Word of God.*" True to this declaration they accept and quote the *De Servo Arbitrio* and other works of Luther as final: "It is certain that Free-will is nothing else than the supreme enemy of righteousness of man's salvation." "We are like a block marred in every possible manner." "In theology man is verily a pillar of salt as was Lot's wife." "Man is absolutely passive and does nothing, but is wholly made." "We are only passive." "We do nothing, but only suffer." "God himself converts us, not we ourselves." It is also said in this Confession: "As in the beginning in the womb of the mother, God creates and forms us men without our coöperation, so also does he recreate us by water and the Spirit, as Prosper beautifully says: '*Vasque novum ex fracto fingit virtute creandi.*'" That is, the Confession of these Ducal

* Schlüsselburg, XIII., 840-844. Otto, p. 56. Preger, II., 173.
† Gieseler, IV., p. 456, note 8.

theologians teaches without qualification or equivocation the *purè passivè* theory of conversion, just as Flacius does in his numerous discussions on Original Sin and on Free-will, and, like Flacius, this second set of Jena Flacianists go back to Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio,* and to other writings of Luther, and they close their Confession by saying that those who interpret Luther's writings differently from what they themselves have done, "Should be publicly censured as falsifiers of Luther's books, as robbers of Christ's Church, as thieves and sacrilegious persons; for they try wickedly, not so much to rob Luther of his books, as God and the entire Church of sound doctrine and of the glorious deposit." *

7. *Conclusion.*

There can be no question as to the teaching of the Flacianists on the subject of Free-will: It is the reproduction of the fatalistic or necessitarian side of Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio.* It declares that in conversion man is a block, a stone, is absolutely passive, does nothing, but simply suffers the operation of God. Their object in the maintenance of such a position is to bestow upon God all honor in the conversion and salvation of man. Their object is commendable. But one profound and evident biblical teaching does not need to be maintained at the expense of another biblical teaching equally profound and equally evident. The Bible does not treat men as stocks and stones, but as rational and ethical beings. It calls upon men to hear the Word of God, to cease resistance, to repent, and to assent to the heavenly message. Such things cannot be done without some activity on the part of man, though such activity is to be considered as absolutely destitute of every kind and degree of justifying merit. It is simply the activity that accepts God's bestowment. It has in it no causal efficiency, neither is it the product of the natural powers of man. *When grace precedes, the Will follows* was the motto and ensign of the Philippists. It redounds to the honor of the Philippists that without derogating from the *Soli Deo Gloria,* or the *Fide Sola,* or the *Propter Christum,* they conserved and promulgated the ethical element in Conversion, and resisted the doctrine of

* This Confession is found in Schlüsselburg, V., 132-200. Schlüsselburg says: "In this Confession, the universal doctrine of Free-will is learnedly, piously, and gravely expounded, and the errors of the Synergists are nervously, perspicuously and solidly reviewed and refuted."

Necessity and the Manichaeism which Melanchthon discovered in the writings of Amsdorf, Flacius, Gallus and Stoltz, and "the fantasies of Schwenckfeld"—all of which he denounced and refuted in his *Opinion*, March 9, 1559, on the Weimar *Confutation Book*.*

Hence when we take full and honest account of the position and teaching of the Philippists on Free-will, we discover at once that the allegations of the Flacianists that the Philippists taught that "the natural man by his natural powers, yet unregenerate, is able, in his conversion or regeneration, to attend to, to understand and to appropriate the things of God," and that the Philippists were Pelagians, sophists, sacrilegious, and "attributed to the power and strength of the natural will some part in conversion" †—that all such allegations are utterly false and without foundation in fact.

But as we have before us the chief writings of the leading Philippists on the subject of Free-will, we are enabled to show exactly what they did teach on the subject. In the case of Melanchthon we refer the reader to what we have said in the preceding chapter. Pfeffinger's views have been set forth at length in the beginning of the present chapter. Strigel speaks most distinctly in his *Declaration*. Of him Salig correctly says: "Strigel never spoke of three efficient and apprehending causes of conversion, but only of three *concurring* causes. The Holy Spirit is the *efficient cause*, the Word the *instrumental*. If it be asked, Is the Will a cause? the answer is: The Will does not have *the nature of an efficient cause*, but in so far as it is assisted, urged, moved, turned, by the Holy Spirit, who works in one way in children, and in another way in adults. The Holy Spirit draws us. The Will does not draw itself, but is drawn by the Word, though not as a block. It has its own *modus agendi*." ‡. To the same effect are Strigel's own declara-

* C. R. IX., 763 *et seqq.*

† Schlüsselburg, V., 16 *et seqq.* Schlüsselburg's account of Synergism, vol. V., 13-51, is a caricature, a tissue of inveracity and sophistry from beginning to end, and has been much used by writers who have not examined the sources of knowledge. He speaks of the Synergists as a sect, and names Melanchthon, George Major, John Pfeffinger, Paul Eber, Victorine Strigel and Paul Crell as the chief promoters of "this error." "Also the anti-Lutheran Wittenbergers, degenerate disciples of Luther, in many accursed books, undertook to defend *synergia* of the carnal Will in spiritual things." He says that such are also called "*coöperators*" from the coöperation which they assign to a dead, unregenerate man in conversion. He says that the Germans call them *Die freywilligen Herrn*, because, contrary to the Word of God, they attribute some freedom to the unregenerate bond Will.

‡ Salig, III., 613-14.

tions in the Weimar *Disputatio,* pp. 8, 40, 102, where he says that neither he nor his preceptors (the Wittenberg theological Faculty) "had ever used the new words, coöperation and synergia." He insisted with Ambrose and Prosper that Free-will is "horribly depraved, not absolutely destroyed." "The question in Free-will is, Whether Free-will is absolutely destroyed, so that man does not differ from a brute and an ass, or whether it is only depraved?"* In his *Loci Theologici,* published posthumously by Pezel, he lays down the proposition: "*The Will is effectively drawn by the Holy Spirit.* Hence we attribute the drawing of the Will to the Holy Spirit, yet, in accordance with the rule of Augustine: The divine actions *ad extra* are common. . . . They who are led by the Spirit of God, that is, are urged, are moved, these are the sons of God. But how does the Holy Spirit draw? Here, in the proposition, it is said the Will is effectively drawn, that is, the Holy Spirit, through the Word, which we never exclude, restores to the Will the power, or strength, or ability to believe, which was lost in the Fall. This power (*dunamin*), this strength (efficaciam), I attribute not to our own powers, which would be blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and the Son of God, but I attribute to the author his own effect, his own work. Therefore I say that the Will is effectively drawn by the Holy Spirit, that is, the power (*dunamis*) of believing is restored."†

In the year 1561 "the anti-Lutheran Wittenbergers, degenerate disciples of Luther," as Schlüsselburg calls the Wittenberg theologians, published a *Confession and Opinion on Free-will.*‡ They reject the conception that man is like a block and is converted while resisting, as the Flacianists taught,§ but they say that "when man consents, he does not do this by the power and worthiness of his own Will, but by the efficacious operation of God, who in this way operates through the Word and the voice of the Gospel, and not otherwise.||

Referring to the accusation of Flacius and his colleagues that Melanchthon, in his *Loci Communes,* teaches that "man by the power of Free-will applies himself to grace," they say: "That is impudens mendacium, for up to this time the passage has not been found."¶

* *Acta Disput. Vinar.* (1562), p. 40.
† *Pars Prima,* pp. 370-1.
‡ Schlüsselburg, V., 525 *et seqq.*
§ *Acta Disput. Vinar.,* ed. Musaeus (1563), pp. 2, 382, *et passim.*
|| Schlüsselburg, V., 529.
¶ *Ibid.,* p. 526.

In the year 1570 these same "degenerate disciples of Luther" issued a manifesto *Containing a Summary of the Chief Chapters of Christian Doctrine taught in the University of Wittenberg.* This Summary is signed *inter alios* by Nicholas Selneccer, who subsequently performed a most conspicuous part in the composition of the Formula of Concord. Under the subject of *Conversion,* Propositions XCVII., XCVIII., these Wittenberg theologians say: "The entire work of conversion is the beneficent action of God alone, as the Prophet cries out: Convert me and I shall be converted, because thou art my Lord God, for after thou hast converted me I will repent, etc. But God has established this order, in order that conversion may be effected in us: God by the Word draws and moves the Will, so that it may not oppose, nor expect compulsion, but may follow the Holy Spirit who draws it, as is said in Romans 8. For so long as the Will altogether resists the Word of God who draws, no conversion takes place. Therefore our churches have always taught that conversion takes place according to the declarations of the ancients: When grace precedes, the will follows; also God draws, but he draws him who is willing; and Nazianzen has very modestly said: All strength is in God alone, but it is given to those who are called and who assent."

Then they condemn the Manichaeans and the Pelagians, and "execrate the madness of the Schwenckfeldians and of the Anabaptists, who contend that God communicates himself to man without the ministry or without reflection on doctrine. But on the contrary, in conversion these three things always concur: The Word of God, the Holy Spirit and the Will of man assenting to and not resisting the Word of God." They also say, as against the Flacianists: "But in the common exercises of the call, of faith, of prayer, of obedience toward God, the human Will, in so far as it has begun to be healed, follows the Holy Spirit, who operates through the Word, and when it is assisted by the Holy Spirit it is not like a block or a stone."

Such, in brief, is the teaching of this book *On Conversion.* In its several hundred pages we have not found a single sentence that justifies the allegation of the Flacianists that the Wittenberg theologians taught that man by his natural powers of Free-will can apply himself to grace or come to conversion, nor is there one word to show that they regarded the Will as *causa efficiens* or *causa meritoria* in attaining faith, conversion, salvation. On the contrary, nowhere in all Lutheran theological literature is the

doctrine of justification by faith alone set forth with greater clearness, and with more frequent use of the *particulae exclusivae* of the *Propter Christum,* of the *gratuita imputatio,* than is done in the section *Of Justification* in this book.*

The doctrine of conversion, as set forth in this book, is exactly that set forth by Melanchthon in the *Loci Communes,* 1535, 1543-1559, and in other discussions of the subject, viz., that when the Will is drawn by God through the instrumentality of the Word, and is assisted by the Holy Spirit, it is not absolutely inactive, but it assents to the Word and does not resist. In Proposition LIII. of this book sin is defined as *anomia,* "not only as vicious actions and inclinations, but also as internal defects"; "actions in the mind, the will, the heart and in the external members, which do contrary to the Law." "Original sin is the horrible evil in the nature of men." "Corruption and depravation of the image of God." "Darkness in the mind." "In the will aversion from God." "In the heart a dreadful contumacy." "This evil most tenaciously clings to the entire substance of man's nature, and with the substance is transmitted to posterity." "But we detest the impious and absurd doctrine of Flacius, who makes sin the substance, and even, as he says, the rational soul itself . . . a physical transformation into a new substance."

Thus it is evident that on every phase of the subjects involved in this controversy the Philippists were soundly Lutheran, and taught in harmony with the Augsburg Confession and its Apology as they had been interpreted *nemine contradicente* for more than a quarter of a century.

The Flacianists were the innovators. They were the ones who tried to insinuate a new doctrine of Free-will into the older Confessions of the Lutheran Church, a doctrine drawn from Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* and, in part at least, based on the Manichaean doctrine of sin, and embracing in its complete concept the doctrine of absolute predestination and that of particularistic election. The Philippists maintained the true Lutheran doctrine of sin, both original and actual; maintained the Lutheran doctrine of the universality of the Call, and taught that when the Will (Voluntas) is *excited* and *assisted* by the Holy Spirit through the Word, it is not absolutely inactive, but assents to or rejects

* The principal title of this very rare book is: *Propositiones, Orationes et Quaestiones, Continentes Summam Confessionis Academiae Witebergensis.* Date of Preface: October, 1570. Printed at Wittenberg by John Schwertel, 1571.

the divine promise and offer of salvation. Their ever-recurring motto was the Augustinian dictum: *When grace precedes, the Will follows.*

But the many protests and explanations of the Philippists availed nothing with the Flacianists. The latter went on with their calumnies and accusations. At the Altenburg Colloquy (1568-9) the Ducal theologians (Jena-Weimar) still accuse the Electoral theologians (Leipzig-Wittenberg) with teaching that "the natural man as regards his natural powers is able in his conversion and regeneration to attend to, to understand, to apprehend the things of God"; "that corrupt man by his natural powers is able not only to attend to the Word, but to understand it"; "that man by doing what is in himself is able to prepare himself for the grace of God"; "that Free-will is the power of self-application to grace." *

The method of these Ducal theologians was simply to garble the statements of their opponents, and then to make comments on the garbled statements. Their own views they avowedly base on Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio,* and then say that their views are in harmony with the Church Fathers and with the Augsburg Confession, whereas it is certain that no Church Father ever taught, as these Ducal theologians do, that man in his conversion is absolutely passive, is like a block, a stone, a pillar of salt, as was Lot's wife. And we have shown that it is both historically and psychologically absurd to read such meaning into the Augsburg Confession.

But happily for the Lutheran Church, this, the most violent of all the Lutheran controversies of the sixteenth century, was confined, in the main, to Ducal Saxony and Electoral Saxony. On the subject of Free-will the Swabians were prevailingly with the Philippists. In Lower Saxony, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, the most influential theologians were essentially Melanchthonians.†

* *Colloquium Altenburgense,* Jena, 1570. *De Libero Arbitrio.*
† See Gieseler, *Church History,* IV., 486, *note* 24.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY.

In Article III. of the Augsburg Confession it is declared that the "one Christ, who is true God and man, was truly born, suffered, was crucified, died and was buried, that he might be a sacrifice, not only for original sin, but also for all other sins, and might appease the wrath of God."

This article is the presupposition and the basis of the declaration contained in Article IV. of the Confession, that "we may acquire the forgiveness of sins and righteousness before God, not by our own merit, work and satisfaction, but that we obtain the forgiveness of sins and are justified before God out of grace for Christ's sake by faith," etc.

The article of Christ and of his work, standing thus so near to the center of the Lutheran system, would be naturally viewed with the liveliest interest, for without the Christ of Article III., there could not be the doctrine of justification as the same is exhibited in Article IV. Hence the doctrine of the person and work of Christ, or Christology, would naturally come to occupy an important place in the Lutheran system; and because of its importance in the system it would be likely to excite controversy. As a matter of fact, the Lutheran Church had a Christological Controversy, and that controversy has left an abiding impression on the confessional history of the Lutheran Church. In its essence the Christology of the Lutheran Church goes back to that of Chalcedon; but it bears characteristics derived from persons and circumstances.

1. *Luther's Christology.*

Luther's Christ was the "true God, begotten of the Father in eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary," as he declares in the Small Catechism. This Christ lay in the manger at Bethlehem, fled into Egypt, was brought up in Nazareth, was seen of men, and died on the Cross. This Christ is himself "true and living God," and by uniting himself with us he abolishes our sin and death, and gives us life and salvation. This Christ, "consisting of two natures, suffered." Because he is divine and

human he is the true mercy-seat. In him and through him we find grace and love and favor. He who seeks God apart from this Christ will find God as he appears in Moses: A God who is a consuming fire.*

These are the fundamental principles of Luther's Christology. With him redemption is the work of the entire Christ, whose two natures operate together in every mediatorial and redemptory transaction.

Hence Luther could not tolerate Zwingli's Alöosis, which, as it seemed to him, separates the natures of Christ and assigns to one nature what the Scriptures assign to the whole person. He maintained that "wherever the operations are divided and separated, the person will also be divided, because all the operations or sufferings must also be attributed to the person and not to the natures. For it is the person which suffers all, one thing according to this nature, and another according to that nature, as all the learned know. Accordingly, we hold our Lord Jesus Christ as God and man in one person, not confounding the natures nor dividing the person." †

And yet Luther, perhaps in reaction against the habit of Scholasticism to lay the chief stress on the divinity of Christ, shows a preference, or at least a great fondness, for the human nature of Christ. He holds that Christ had a human development. He acted, played, suffered, and did this, that and the other thing, just like other children, yet without sin. He grew in spirit and in wisdom, and as man he did not always know all things. The very flesh of Christ must be observed: "Let us turn from those who say: The flesh profiteth nothing. Rather turn and say: God without flesh profiteth nothing. For upon the flesh of Christ, upon the child who lay on the bosom of the Virgin must the eyes be fastened, so that we can say with absolute confidence: I have no God, neither in heaven nor on the earth, I even know of none, apart from the flesh which lay on the bosom of the Virgin Mary. If thou sayest this, then fear not that thou wilt depart from God, or that thy heart will fall into doubt through fright and fear." ‡

And as a correlate of this view of Christ as God and man existing and manifest in one undivided and indivisible person, Luther held that the Christian is personally united with Christ:

* See Luther's *Schriften*, St. Louis ed., VI., 49-51. Jena edition, VII., 99*b*.

† *Werke*, Erl. Ed., 30: 200 *et seqq.*

‡ *Werke*, St. Louis Ed., VI., 50.

"Thou hast taken mine, and hast given me thine. Thou didst become what thou wast not and didst make me what I was not." Faith unites Christ and the believer in a spiritual union which is more intimate than that of flesh and blood, a kind of *communicatio idiomatum,* in which there is a reciprocal giving and taking. Christ gives me his righteousness, and takes the guilt of my sin and makes me a child of God: "In Christ and with Christ I have at once the heart and will of the Father, the person in whom the Father dwells bodily, so that in Christ and through Christ, I am one thing with the Father." Christ became incarnate by the Virgin Mary that he might draw us who believe on the Father, as he is in the Father: "This connection has he established between himself and us and the Father, and in this he embraces us, so that we are now in him, and he in us, as he is in the Father and the Father in us. By this union and communion our sin and death are removed, and we have life and salvation instead." "What he is by nature that we become by grace: The sons of God, copartners, partakers of the divine nature, and thus by faith in him the incarnation is representatively continued." *

It cannot be denied that in this representation there is an element of mysticism. But in the mind of Luther this was judiciously balanced by the purely objective character of his doctrine of justification, which has its ground in the divine-human Christ, who in his two natures operates for us as one undivided person, before he dwells in us and unites us with himself and his Father. First comes justification as a forensic act of God. Then comes the mystic union with God. The former is *for the sake* of Christ. The latter is *through* Christ. Christ as true man and true God forms the connecting link between man and God the Father. The consciousness of a union thus formed may be called mysticism, and is sure to dwell in the Christian mind that is naturally speculative and intuitively religious.

2. *Melanchthon.*

Melanchthon's unspeculative mind developed nothing new in Christology. He regarded the *communicatio idiomatum* as a figure of speech.† He held that there are two natures in Christ, and that Christ died. The presence of one nature in Christ does not hinder the operations peculiar to the other nature. It belongs

* See Thomasius, *Dogmengeschichte,* II., 578.

† Est autem figura sermonis, qua proprietas alteri naturae conveniens tribuitur toti personae in concreto ut Deus est homo, Christus est mortuus. C. R. XXI., 363.

to the human nature to suffer and to die. What belongs to the one nature is attributed to the entire person in the concrete, so that God is man, Christ is God. His own words, as found in the last edition of the *Loci Communes* (1559), are as follows: "This proposition is not true: The divine nature is human. But this is true: God is man, the Word is man, Christ is man, Christ is God. God was born of a virgin, suffered; because this person in whom by the personal union the divine is united to the human nature, is born, is crucified. This form of speaking in the concrete we call *communicatio idiomatum*, that is, a declaration by which the properties of the natures are correctly attributed to the person, so that the Son of God is Redeemer, and not the human nature only." *

And in the matter of justification Melanchthon lays all stress on its purely objective, forensic character. With him, faith is not merely *fides*, but rather is it *fiducia*, the confidence of the heart; and by no means is faith the knowledge of history. It is not enough to believe that Christ was born, suffered, died, rose again. Faith must embrace the final cause of history: *The Remission of Sins*. And this remission of sins does not come on account of virtues or of any excellence of character in us, but is bestowed alone for the sake of Christ. Nor does faith justify because it is a meritorious work, but alone because it lays hold of the promised mercy.†

None the less objective is he in the last edition of the *Loci*, where he says: "We are justified by faith, that is, by confidence in mercy we are received for the sake of Christ, not on account of our own virtues. For this mercy is laid hold of by faith or by confidence." He holds that good works, or the new obedience, are the fruits of faith: "Our obedience, that is, the righteousness of a good conscience or of works, which God enjoins upon us, ought necessarily to follow reconciliation. For Christ manifestly commands in regard to repentance, and Paul says: We are debtors, not to live after the flesh."

All this is plain and didactic. It is the Christology of the Fathers restated principally in opposition to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, which had joined faith and works in the Article of Justification, and had in large part swept Christ from the vision of the people. It does not differ in its christological aspects from the doctrine of Luther, except that it has no speculative element, such as Luther introduced in connection

* C. R. XXI., 627. † So in the Apology, Art. *De Justificatione.*

with his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and no mystical element, such as Luther often introduced in his *The Freedom of a Christian Man,* and in his *House Postils,* though as Luther grew older his sense of the Christ *for* us more and more took precedence of his sense of the Christ *in* us.*

3. *Andrew Osiander.*

Andrew Osiander was born at Gunzenhausen on the Altmühl, some six German miles from Nürnberg, December 19, 1498. He attended school at Leipzig and at Altenburg, and later he entered the University of Ingolstadt. He studied theology at Wittenberg. In 1520 he became teacher of Hebrew in the Augustinian Cloister at Nürnberg. In 1522 he was elected preacher in the St. Lawrence Church, and entered soon upon his active career of reformer. In 1530 he attended the Diet of Augsburg as one of the Nürnberg legates. In 1530-3 he assisted in composing the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Church Order. Refusing to submit to the Augsburg Interim, he went into voluntary exile and came to Königsberg, in East Prussia, at the beginning of 1549. Very soon thereafter he became pastor of the Old City Church, and then first professor of theology in the University. He was a talented and learned man, and had been regarded as a sound Lutheran, though he probably had never had a clear apprehension of the Lutheran doctrine of justification. At least, in a disputation held in October, 1550, on Justification by Faith, which was followed in 1551 by a treatise, entitled *Of the Only Mediator Jesus Christ and Justification by Faith,* he developed views that brought on the *Osiandrian Controversy,* in which Philippists and Flacianists stood essentially together in opposition to Osiander and his followers, though John Brentz, who agreed perfectly with Melanchthon in all other doctrines, sympathized strongly with Osiander.†

Instead of setting forth justification as an external, objective, forensic act, by which one who believes in Christ is declared righteous in the sight of God, Osiander taught that justification is an internal, subjective, personal change effected in the believer by the infusion into him of the divine nature of Christ, or by the personal indwelling of the Logos in the believer.‡

* Köstlin's *Luther's Theology* (Eng. Trans.), II., 425 *et seqq.*

† C. R. IX., 311, 319, 402, 452, 457. *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1905, pp. 338-9.

‡ *Verein für Reformationsgeschichte,* No. 45, p. 62. For an extended account of Osiander's course at Königsberg, and for his theses, on which he

It was at once seen that such a view of justification deprives faith of its significance as an instrument whose immediate object is the promise of grace contained in the Gospel. In the genuine Lutheran doctrine of justification, faith and the promise are held to be correlates of each other. The promise must be accepted by faith. The Gospel offers and promises reconciliation to all who believe.

None the less apparent was it that the Osiandrian theory reduces the value of the concrete Christ. It virtually excludes the humanity of Christ as a factor in his redemptory activity, and says that we are saved by the divinity of Christ. At least, the supreme stress is laid on the *divinity* of Christ, not on the God-man. Osiander says: "The divine Word (Essence) renews our old man totally, so that we become new creatures." "To justify, in its proper and primary sense, means to make a just person out of an unjust one, that is, to recall a dead person to life." "Because the Gospel brings the Word of God, that is, Christ, into the heart, soul and spirit, so that we are quickened thereby, we live in God and from God; yea, God himself is our life, and recovers his power, and justifies, that is, makes us righteous, and that in the very sense in which he makes us alive." "God dwells in believers according to his true divine essence. For where Christ is, there also is his divine nature or essence; but where the Son of God is according to his divine essence, there are the Father and the Holy Spirit inseparably. For Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one eternal indivisible divine essence." "They teach more coldly than ice who teach that we are accounted righteous only on account of the forgiveness of sins, and not on account of the righteousness of Christ which dwells in us by faith." "God dwells in believers according to his true divine essence. For where Christ is, there also is his divine nature or essence; but where the Son of God is according to his divine essence, there are the Father and the Holy Spirit inseparably. For Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one eternal indivisible divine essence." He repeatedly insists that Christ is our righteousness, the Holy Spirit is our righteousness, the Father is our righteousness. The reason given for this threefold statement is that there is only one and the same divine Essence. He does not dispense with faith. Faith is our righteousness, not because it is a good work, but because it allows Christ to dwell in us.

held a disputation, October 24, 1550, see Hartknoch, *Preussische Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 309 *et seqq.*

Neither is the human nature ignored in Osiander's theory. He declares that the indwelling of the divine nature of Christ is mediated through the humanity of Christ. But he does not define the method of the use of the humanity. His constant reiteration is that justification is founded alone on the divine nature, more particularly, on the divine essence of Christ. He says: "My clear, true and plain answer is that Christ is our righteousness according to his divine nature, and not according to his human nature, although we cannot find, obtain or lay hold on such divine righteousness apart from the humanity. But when he dwells in us through faith, he brings with himself into us his righteousness, which is his divine nature, and this is imputed unto us as if it were our own. Yea, it is bestowed upon us, and flows from his humanity as from the head unto us as his members, and moves us to yield our members instruments of righteousness unto God."

When he says that faith justifies, he does not mean faith as an act, but Christ, rather the divine nature of Christ, which is appropriated by faith. "Faith is as it were the empty cup. Christ is the potion which fills it."

It is easy to see that Osiander's theory is catholicising and mystical. It makes more of the Christ *in* us, than it does of the Christ *for* us. It deprives faith of its proper function and of its proper object. According to the Lutheran doctrine faith lays hold of the entire Christ and receives pardon *for the sake of* the entire Christ. Justification is out of grace, through faith, for the sake of Christ. The indwelling of Christ comes as a consequence of the objective, forensic act.

Dr. Frank has described the Osiandrian theory as follows: "This is not Pantheism or a mingling of the divine and human natures, as Osiander's enemies complained, but it is a subjectivism which shatters the objective basis of salvation according to the Lutheran Church even to its very depths, a mysticism, the Christ for us for the Christ in us, and unwillingly makes the consciousness of the indwelling essential righteousness the basis of peace with God." *

4. *Francis Stancar.*

Francis Stancar was born in Mantua about the year 1501. He received his education in a cloister, and was well trained in the philosophy of Aristotle and in Scholasticism, to which he added

* *Die Theologie der Concordienformel,* II., p. 19. See Schlüsselburg, VI.,

a considerable knowledge of the Hebrew and Chaldee languages. At the beginning of the persecution inaugurated by Pope Paul III., he, with other friends of the Reformation, fled into Switzerland, and after some years of uncertain residence he was made Professor of the Hebrew Language in the University of Königsberg, May 8, 1551. He was controversial by nature, and soon found himself in opposition to the teaching of Osiander. As Osiander had laid the chief stress on the divine nature of Christ and on the indwelling of Christ in the believer, Stancar, in his resilience from this extreme went to the very opposite extreme, and denied the participation of the divine nature of Christ in the work of redemption, and declared that our justification is based on the human obedience and suffering of Christ. He says: "Christ is our righteousness only according to his human righteousness, and not according to the divine." His fundamental principles were: That God is one: That the Mediator is not of the one: That the Son also is that one God: That it behooved the Mediator to die: That Christ suffered according to the flesh.

These principles are not all wrong. But Stancar made a false application of his fundamental principles. His chief false conclusion was that, since Christ is God, he cannot be a Mediator between God and man, as one cannot be a mediator between himself and another: "The Son of God in his own proper divine nature, which he has in common with the Father and with the Holy Spirit, cannot be Mediator, except only according to the human nature." And again: "I exclude the divine nature from the office of the priesthood and mediation of Christ, but not from the person." "If the Son according to the divine nature would be Mediator, and would do something which the Father and the Holy Spirit could not do, then he would have a will and an operation different from that of the Father and of the Holy Spirit, and consequently another nature, and thus he would be another God than the Father and the Holy Spirit."

This teaching, by excluding the divine nature of Christ from participation in the offices and work of Christ, destroys the personal unity of Christ and goes the way of Nestorianism. If the divine nature has no part in redemption and does nothing in mediation, then it stands in no personal relation to the human nature. It is an abstraction, and redemption is effected by a

42 *et seqq.* Thomasius, *Dogmengeschichte,* II., 437 *et seqq.* Ritschl, *History of Justification and Sanctification,* Eng. Trans., p. 215. Gieseler, *Church History,* IV., 469 *et seqq.* Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte,* pp. 869 *et seqq.* Möller, *Andreas Osiander. Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften.*

nature, not by a *person.* Hence it avails nothing for Stancar to say that he does not exclude the divine nature from the person of Christ, so long as he says that he excludes it from the work of Christ. If Christ be one person, if the natures of Christ be united in that one person, then it must follow that whatever Christ does, he does as a person, not as a nature, otherwise there would be no true incarnation, but only a juxtaposition of the two natures. A personal union of two natures involves a personal participation of the two natures in affections and actions. This is what the Church has always taught in her Christology. A union that does not recognize the personal participation of the natures in affections and actions is external and mechanical. Over against such a union the Church has always held that the union is personal, and that for the work of redemption there must be a coöperation of both natures of Christ in and by the one divine-human person. It is the person that acts through the natures, but never through the one nature to the exclusion of the other.*

5. *The Opposition to Osiander and Stancar.*

The opposition to Osiander and Stancar was prompt and decided. Here Melanchthon and other Wittenbergers and the Flacianists entered the lists together against Osiander. Answers were made to his *Confession* by the theologians of Weimar and Coburg, of Brandenburg, of Pomerania, of Hamburg and Lüneburg, and by individuals.† In an academic oration, delivered in 1553, Melanchthon refuted some of the calumnies of Osiander.‡ In a private letter to the Osiandrian Culmann of Nürnberg, December 11, 1552, Melanchthon declared: "We say here that man becomes acceptable by faith on account of the Mediator, God and man, and that faith depends not upon these new actions, but upon that Mediator. And the obedience of the Mediator is infinitely to be preferred to those actions which are done by us." § In 1555 he wrote a *Confutation* of the Osian-

* See Schlüsselburg, IX., 36 *et seqq.* Thomasius, II., 456 *et seqq.* Walch, *Einleitung,* IV., V., 171 *et seqq.* Planck, IV., pp. 249 *et seqq.* In his *De Trinitate & Mediatore* Stancar says: "One Peter Lombard is of more authority than a hundred Luthers, two hundred Melanchthons, three hundred Bullingers, four hundred Peter Martyrs, five hundred Calvins, for if all these were brayed in a mortar, not one grain of true theology would be squeezed out." He called Melanchthon an antichrist. Walch, *ut supra,* p. 177.

† Walch, *Einleitung,* IV., V., 156 *et seqq.* Gieseler, IV., 474-5.

‡ C. R. XII., 6 *et seqq.*

§ C. R. VII., 1151.

drian doctrine. He declares that Osiander's definition of righteousness is *legal,* not Pauline; it is that by which we do right: "Hence man is justified by doing right." On the contrary, Paul, David and all the saints know that for the sake of the Mediator they receive the pardon of sins freely and are reconciled to God, and become acceptable to him. Also: "For the sake of the obedience of the Mediator and on account of the death or the blood of Christ are we justified." He affirms the necessity of the divine indwelling, but this must follow faith, and the pardon of sins for the sake of the obedience of the Mediator. He says that Osiander repudiates this doctrine, and contends that we are justified by the indwelling of God, and not for the sake of the obedience of the Mediator. He thus detracts from the honor due to the Mediator, obscures the magnitude of sin, destroys the chief consolation of the pious and brings them into perpetual doubt. He regards the doctrine of Osiander as false, injurious to consciences, to be shunned and condemned.* Others, as Flacius, Menius and Mörlin, were equally emphatic in their protests against the doctrine of Osiander, which is a wide departure from the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone, and is a close approximation to the Roman Catholic doctrine of *justitia infusa.*

Not less positive and emphatic were Melanchthon and others in their rejection of the position of Stancar in the matter of justification. In the year 1553 Melanchthon, while sojourning at Dessau, wrote an opinion on the question, *Is Christ Mediator only according to the Human Nature?* After showing from the Scriptures and from standard teachers of the primitive Church that Christ is naturally and essentially God and man in one person, he quotes Ambrose: "That he might be Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, not without the divinity, because in God was man, and God was in man, that from both he might be Mediator." And again: "The passage in the Epistle to Timothy does not exclude the divine nature, because it names the person: One Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus. But Christ is the name of a person in whom are two natures, as if to say: This man Christ is Mediator, not other men, as Abraham or Moses, of whom it is also written in Deut. 5: I stood between God and you, etc. But this only Son of God is Mediator, because he by his assumed human

* C. R. VIII., 579 *et seqq.* Thomasius, II., 446 *et seqq.* Schmidt, *Philipp Melanchthon,* pp. 555 *et seqq.*

nature is propitiator. Hence it does not follow that the human nature alone is Mediator."* John Wigand, Calvin and the Zürich theologians controverted Stancar's position.†

6. *The Swabians and Saxons.*

The Christological theories of Osiander and Stancar had reference more particularly to the natures of Christ regarded in separation from each other. Naturally the question of the relations of each nature to the other or the *Communicatio Idiomatum,* that is, the communication of the properties of the one nature to the other nature would soon be raised. In the interrelation of the natures of the person of Christ, the Würtemberg divines sought a philosophical foundation for the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. On the Chalcedonic Symbol as a basis, and on a distinction made by Luther in his *Greater Confession,*‡ they developed the doctrine that the Logos, from the very moment of the incarnation, imparted divine attributes to the human nature, or so infused the divine substance into the assumed human nature, that the said human nature possessed the divine attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence.

John Brentz wrote as follows: "He, true God and man, that is, at the same time by his divinity and humanity even from the beginning of the incarnation, filled all things. Wherever the deity is, there also is the humanity. The God so assumed the man into the unity of the person that he poured into him all his fulness, not only omnipotence, but also omniscience, omnipotence and omnipresence." "He was omnipresent, almighty, omniscient while he lay in the manger." "When Lazarus was dead he (Christ) sojourned in his external relations away from Bethany, while in his majesty he was present, not only with that dead man, but with all the dead, in order to preserve them for the future resurrection. In his humiliation he hung on the cross, while in his majesty he darkened the sun, and kept alive all the living. He lay in the grave while filling and ruling heaven and earth with all power."

It will thus be seen that Ubiquity, according to Brentz, belongs to the humanity of Christ by virtue of the hypostatic union, and is absolute. It is not something belonging to the

* C. R. XXIII., 87 *et seqq.;* 93 *et seqq.*
† Walch, *Einleitung,* IV., V., 180-2.
‡ Erl. Ed., 30: 206 *et passim.*

will; it is something given in the incarnation as a law of Christ's being. In the *Confession of Faith concerning the Lord's Supper,* composed at Stuttgart in 1559, it is declared that "the man Christ fills all things in a heavenly manner inscrutable to human reason." *

This is an extreme or one-sided development of Luther's doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum,* and is known as "the Swabian view." In the next century this view was long and ardently defended by the Tübingen theologians as *Krypticism.* Opposed to this was "the Saxon view," whose ablest defender was Martin Chemnitz, of Brunswick. His book entitled, *Of the Two Natures in Christ,* is preëminently the Lutheran classic on the subject of which it treats. In discussing the exaltation of the human nature of Christ, Chemnitz starts with a comparison: "God or the Holy Trinity so dwells in believers that he imparts to them certain preternatural, gracious, spiritual, heavenly, divine gifts. These are not the essential, infinite idiomata of Divinity, but they are the gracious gifts so conferred by the operation of the Divinity that they dwell formally, habitually and subjectively in the Saints, so that believers are called 'partakers of the divine nature' " (2 Peter 1:4), and have "the communion of the Holy Spirit" (2 Cor. 13:14). "Therefore when the Divine nature of the Logos, not only by the grace of indwelling, but by the whole fulness, dwells personally in his assumed human nature, which by the hypostatic union he makes his own, it would be impious and blasphemous to suppose that the human nature of Christ in the hypostatic union is left *in puris naturalibus,* and from that personal union nothing is left but its own essential idiomata, nothing except its own physical powers, faculties and conditions, and nothing beyond its own natural operations. But it is correctly and scripturally declared by the scholastic writers that when Christ was anointed, according to the assumed nature, above his fellows—not only man, but also angels—the divine nature of the Logos by its own divine energy conferred on and poured into the human nature, with which it was hypostatically united, spiritual, heavenly and divine gifts, not only certain peculiar ones, determined by a fixed number and by measured grades, as in the saints, but all divine gifts with perfect fulness, superabounding plenty—the supreme and absolute per-

* Thomasius, *Dogmengeschichte,* II., 604 *et seqq.* Also, Pfaff, *Acta et Scripta,* pp. 334, 342. *Württembergische Kirchengeschichte,* p. 394.

fection—which gifts can be conferred on a created essence in itself, above every name, number and measure. For if Divinity dwelling in the saints by grace, as a true light spreads the rays of his virtues and pours them into the saints, and like a living fountain pours the stream of his blessings into believers, we must conclude that such things can be done much more fully and completely in that human nature in which the whole fulness of Deity dwells bodily. But such infused gifts are not the essential idiomata of the Deity, but are its effects *extra Divinitatem* upon the human nature of Christ, so infused, that, as the Scholastics say, they inhere in it formally, habitually, and subjectively, and so inform and perfect the humanity of Christ in itself and according to itself, that it becomes the fit, proper and rightly disposed organ through which and by the communion and coöperation of which the divine power of the Logos can exert and can accomplish the operations of the divine majesty. And these gifts, like those of the substance of the human nature to which they formally inhere, are in themselves created and finite.'' *

Chemnitz bases his Christology chiefly on the *power of the Logos,* and on the principle that the two natures form one personality. The Logos, by virtue of the hypostatic union, communicates certain supernatural or preternatural gifts, as the effects of Divinity infused *extra Divinitatem* into the assumed human nature. These gifts and effects, moreover, are *created* and *finite.* The human nature does not possess an omnipresence such as is affirmed by Brentz, but a *multipresence* depending upon the will of the Logos. To explain this infusion of gifts, Chemnitz uses the *perichorasis* (permeation), and takes an illustration from the sun, which, astronomically considered, is a luminous body, and imparts light to other bodies, as to the moon. ''So in Christ there is not a twofold vivifying life, nor a twofold divine power, majesty, wisdom, etc.; but only one, which is essential and proper, and belongs to the divine nature alone. But by means of the union it is communicated to the assumed nature, not by physical confusion, effusion, equalization, but by means of the union, because these divine idiomata exert and exercise their faculties and operations on, with and through the assumed nature. And the flesh quickens, not by its own formal virtue, but by the virtue of the Logos dwelling personally in that flesh by means of the union. Thus the true

* *De Duabus Naturis in Christo,* Cap. XX.

union is of such a nature that there is no confusion or equalization of the natures or essential properties.'' *

Professor Dorner has summarized this view as follows: ''Although the humanity of Christ remains necessarily limited, his body retains eternally its organization and symmetry and never becomes infinite. Although humanity can never, in any case, have infinitude in itself subjectively, formally, inherently, the divine nature is notwithstanding communicated to it, *above* and *against* its nature by the indissoluble 'Unio' of the Logos. It is robbed of its own personality (for which reason he terms it a 'massa'), but the hypostasis of the Logos becomes also hypostasis for the human nature which he takes up unto himself.''

It will thus be seen that the two Christologies, the *Swabian* and the *Saxon*, differ widely from each other. They start from different principles, and, as a consequence, they reach different conclusions. In the Swabian view the Logos is represented as entering the assumed human nature and as no longer existing, subsequently, out of the man Christ. In the Saxon view the Logos imparts his personality to the human nature, and effects in it certain transcendent gifts, but does not endow it with omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence. The former view, doubtless, is superior in speculative features. The latter has the advantage in the practical aspects, since it exhibits to us the Christ of the Gospels, who, as man, draws nigh unto us; whereas the other view so deifies the humanity of Christ as to remove him from human fellowship, for it is difficult to see how a nature which possesses divine attributes inherently can be touched with a sense of human infirmities.†

* *Ut supra*, Cap. VI.

† For further information in regard to these two Christologies, see Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ*, Div. II., 176-208. Thomasius, II., pp. 601 *et seqq.* Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte*, 911, 912, 922.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE SOTERIOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY.

Several of the subjects treated in the present chapter have already received incidental attention; but it seems desirable to give them a more specific treatment, in order that it may be understood why they should be discussed in the Formula of Concord, which was prepared for the purpose of putting an end to the controversies which had come to exist in the seventh and eighth decades of the sixteenth century. And in the interest of brevity we have grouped the subjects now to be treated under Soteriology, though some of them contain elements that bring them into contact with Anthropology and Christology. But then it must be remembered that Anthropology, Christology and Soteriology are themselves so closely related that none of them can be properly and profitably treated in entire isolation from the other two.

1. *The Sacramental Controversy.*

Even in the very beginning of his career, Luther laid much stress on the sacraments as means of grace, as instruments through which God bestows salvation on men who believe. He regards baptism as the first of the sacraments and as the foundation of the whole Christian life. It is essentially a promise. On this promise, which must be received by faith, depends our salvation. If this promise be not received, baptism profiteth nothing. The Christian must recall his baptism, and remember the promise it contains. "His heart will be marvelously comforted, and encouraged to hope for mercy, if he fixes his eyes upon that divine promise once made to him, which cannot lie, and which still continues entire, unchanged, and unchangeable by any sins of his; as Paul says: 'If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself.'" (2 Tim. 2:13). This truth of God will preserve him; and even if all other hopes perish, this, if he believes it, will not fail him. Through this truth he will have something to oppose to the insolent adversary; he will have a barrier to throw in the way of the sins which disturb his conscience; he will have an answer to the

dread of death and judgment; finally, he will have a consolation under every kind of temptation, in being able to say: "God is faithful to his promise; and in baptism I received the sign of that promise. If God is for me who can be against me?" *

In his exposition of Matt. 3:13-17, in the year 1535, he affirms that baptism is right in itself, "as good, as holy, as divine to the unbeliever as to him who believes," yet there is a great difference in the effect. The unbeliever receives no benefit. His heart is closed so that he cannot receive its benefit. But "whosoever believes that for him God has instituted in baptism a washing of regeneration, by which he is washed from sins, and becomes the child of God, receives it and finds it as he believed. For his heart is open, and the influence of baptism enters it with all its force, enlightens and warms him, and constitutes out of the old, inanimate man, a saint with a new principle of life." He thus everywhere, when treating of the subject associates faith with the efficacy of baptism. Where there is no faith, there is no regeneration, no consolation, from baptism.

These views in regard to baptism so generally prevailed among the Lutherans, that there was no baptismal controversy among them. All regarded baptism essentially alike as the sign of a promise of grace, which is valid when administered according to the divine appointment, and is efficacious when received by faith.

The sacramental controversy among the Lutherans had reference to the Lord's Supper. From the beginning of his reformatory career, Luther laid stress on the real presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and on the oral eating and drinking of the same. As we have seen, he emphasized the flesh of Christ. He speaks of "flesh of God," "flesh of Spirit." This flesh the mouth eats for the heart. The bread is the body of Christ. The bread becomes the body of Christ. "The body is crushed by the teeth." "What the bread does and suffers, that the body of Christ does and suffers." The body of Christ is in, with and under the bread.†

This extreme objectivity of statement was called out in antithesis to the extreme subjectivity of the Sacramentarians. Luther believed that God has power and ways by which he can

* *Babylonish Captivity of the Church,* 1520.

† Erl. Edition, 55: 75, 76; Ibid. 30: 297. See Thomasius, II., 532-534; De Wette's *Luther's Briefe,* IV., 572, 569; C. R. II., 822.

carry his word into effect. "We believe that his body is there where his Word sounds, 'this is my body.'" And closely connected with this was his doctrine, drawn from the scholastic philosophy of the *repletive* presence, according to which Christ takes up no space, but pervades the entire creation: "God is not a being expanded so long, broad, thick, high, deep, but a being supernatural and inscrutable; one who is capable of existing in every little grain of sand, full and entire, and at the same time extends into all, over all, and beyond all creation. Therefore there is no need of diminution or contraction here." And of the eating he says: "Both mouth and heart eat, each according to its own measure and method. The heart cannot eat bodily. The mouth cannot eat spiritually. God brings it about that the mouth eats bodily for the heart, and the heart eats spiritually for the mouth, and thus both are satisfied and saved by the one kind of food. The irrational body does not know that it is eating food by which it shall live forever, for it perceives nothing, but dies and decays, just as when it has eaten other food like an irrational animal. But the soul sees and understands that the body must live eternally, because it has partaken of an eternal food, which will not suffer it to decay and putrefy in the grave or in the dust." *

But this sacramental eating Luther regards as inexplicable. He does not even wish to understand it: "We maintain, believe and teach that in the Supper we truly and bodily eat the body of Christ and appropriate it. But how this is done, or how it is in the bread, we do not and should not know. We should believe God's Word and should limit him neither in method nor in measure. We see the bread with our eyes, but we hear with our ears that the body of Christ is there." †

The quotations given above represent Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper up to and including the year 1528, the year in which he published his *Greater Confession on the Lord's Supper*. In the year 1544 he published his *Small Confession of the Holy Sacrament*, in which he affirms with all the energy of conviction his former teaching on the subject, namely, that Christ's body is definitively, that is, certainly present in the Eucharist, and is received alike by a Judas and by the saints.‡ It may be said that his fundamental position is not only that

* Jena Ed. of Works, III., 363. See also Wangemann, *Una Sancta*, 5: 78 *et seqq.*

† Erl. Ed., 32: 396 *et seqq.*

Christ is present in the Eucharist, but that in the Holy Supper he gives himself to the Communicant, whether the latter be a believer or an unbeliever.*

It will thus be seen that Luther represents the dogmatic view of the Sacrament. He interprets the words of institution in the most literal sense. The *Hoc est corpus meum,* which he wrote down on the table at the Marburg Colloquy, was his watchword through the remainder of his life as in effect it had been previously when treating of the Lord's Supper. And yet it cannot be denied that his "repletive" has in it a speculative element. This speculative element was employed by the Swabians when they launched their doctrine of the absolute ubiquity of the human nature of Christ. But it cannot be said that oral manducation is a necessary part of Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, since it does not appear in the Small Catechism, nor in the Large Catechism, nor in the Schmalkald Articles, nor did he desiderate it in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology. And much less can it be said that his "crushed by the teeth" is a necessary part of his doctrine. Nor are any of these explanatory extra-biblical terms and phrases generic in the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, since there are now and for hundreds of years have been Lutheran churches which have no such definitive terms and phrases in their confessional books. But they furnished the premises on which dogmatists and traditionalists based Romanizing conclusions.

Melanchthon never departed from the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, nor from the essentials of the Lutheran teaching on the subject, though later in life he laid more emphasis on the ethical features of the sacraments. For proof of these affirmations we quote from the *Corpus Philippicum,*† the Preface to which Melanchthon wrote only two months before his death. "In this communion Christ is truly and substantially present, and is truly administered to those who take the body and blood of Christ. Christ testifies as to what is done in them and makes them his members, and washes them with his own blood, as Hilary says: 'These things taken and appropriated cause us to be in Christ and Christ in us,' " p. 270.

"Christ is truly present, and by means of this service he gives his body and blood to him who eats and drinks. So say

* Erl. Edition, 55: 76, 77. *Schmalkald Articles,* Part III., Art. VI.
† Leipzig Ed., 1563.

also the ancient writers. Cyril says: 'We must consider that Christ is in us not only by love, but also by natural participation, that is, he is present not only by efficacy, but also by substance. . . . Faith is necessary to seek and to accept the pardon of sins. For here the pardon of sins is offered and is applied to him who believes,'' pp. 563, 565. He declares that the principal end is the confirmation of faith.

''What is the Lord's Supper? It is the communication of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ as it was instituted in the words of the Gospel, in the taking of which the Son of God is truly and substantially present, and testifies that he applies his blessing to believers, and that he assumed human nature for our sake, in order that he might make us who are united with himself by faith, his own members and cleanse us by his own blood,'' p. 810.

''He (Christ) is truly and substantially present, applies himself and his blessings by the communication of his body and blood, and wishes us to believe that by his death he truly merits for us the pardon of sins and righteousness, and that he rose from the dead and lives and makes us his own members, and truly wishes to be efficacious in us,'' p. 909.

Melanchthon does not echo Luther's words, nor does he speak of a repletive presence or of oral manducation, but without hesitation and without equivocation he affirms the substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and the communication of the body and blood of Christ to the communicant, and in the emphasis which he places upon the sacrament as a sign, a seal, a testimony, an application of the blessing and benefits of Christ, he surpasses Luther,* as might be expected of one who declared that the aim of all his theologizing was to make men better.†

Against this teaching by Melanchthon, Luther never raised a word of objection, not even in the *Small Confession* of 1544, in which he so violently assailed all those who had differed from him in his teachings on the Lord's Supper; but he actually endorsed Melanchthon's teaching on this and on all other subjects, when in 1545 he extolled Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* above all other books of divinity. Hence we may say that Luther and Melanchthon were one in their doctrine of the Lord's Supper—not one in phraseology, but one in the essential things, namely, in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, in the communi-

* *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum, ut supra,* pp. 811 *et seqq.*
† C. R. I., 722.

cation of the body and blood of Christ to the communicant and in the necessity of faith for the profitable use of the sacrament. And if outside proof were needed to confirm this we have it in a letter written by David Chytraeus in 1581, in which it is affirmed that Luther and Melanchthon and all their colleagues taught the doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist; Chytraeus also takes particular pains to say: "I recognize both Luther and Melanchthon as taught of God and orthodox," and says that "Philip always acknowledged Luther as his teacher in theology, and honored and praised him," and that he quoted Luther's writings and declared that he had gathered into the *Loci* and promulgated the doctrines contained in Luther's writings.*

But by and by the ultra Lutherans emphasized the accidents rather than the essentials of Luther's teaching, and more and more laid stress on oral manducation, on the sacramental union, on the *in, cum, sub pane et vino,* that is, on the dogmatic and extra-biblical content, and on the conception that there can be no substantial reception of Christ apart from the sacraments, since the heavenly gift is imparted only *in, with* and *under* the sacraments. Some of the theologians of this party so connected Christ with the bread of the sacrament as to decide that if a mouse should eat the consecrated wafer, it would eat the very body of Christ. Others held that a drop of the consecrated wine profaned the beard of a man, or a garment, or the ground, on which it chanced to fall; and even the fingers of a minister, who had accidentally spilled a little wine at the communion, were cut off by order of his Prince.†

Such remnants of popery, such superstitions, and such revolting cruelty, grew out of the most extreme and one-sided pressing of Luther's view of the sacramental union, and were doubtless closely connected with the Swabian Christology or its premises. Such superstitions and such cruelties lay not far from magical and *ex opere operato* conceptions of the sacrament as an instrument for imparting salvation.

Over against such superstitions and absurdities the followers of Melanchthon insisted more and more on the union of the living Christ, the God-man, with the believer, and on the indwelling of Christ in the believer. Such presence of Christ was

* *Epistolae,* pp. 106 *et seqq.*

† For details and additional facts of this kind, together with references to authorities, see Salig, III., 461 *et seqq.;* Galle, *Charakteristik Melanch-*

not less real than that contended for by the rigid adherents of Luther. It was less dogmatic but more religious and ethical. But some of this side ultimately carried their view as far in the direction of Calvinism (Crypto-Calvinism) as the others had carried their view in the direction of Romanism.

The two views and the two tendencies are absolutely irreconcilable with each other. In the extreme form in which they appeared in the seventh decade of the sixteenth century they do not represent the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper as the same had been set forth in the official witnesses of the Lutheran Church.

2. *The Adiaphoristic Controversy.*

This controversy grew out of the Leipzig Interim of 1548 (pp. 321 *et seqq.*); and yet it is closely related to the controversy on the Lord's Supper. It had to do with the nature of ecclesiastical ceremonies, or with the questions, To what extent is salvation associated with the mediation of the Church? What things are essential and what things are indifferent in the mediation of salvation? The older Confessions of the Lutheran Church had not condemned the use of human ordinances; they had only denied that "uniform ceremonies" are necessary as a mark of the true unity of the Church, and that "human ordinances contribute to the remission of sins, or merit salvation." The Leipzig Interim restored the jurisdiction of the Bishops and recalled a very large part of the ceremonies connected with the Roman Catholic service of the Mass. These things were not indeed to be regarded as institutions that had been divinely enjoined, but as institutions that might be tolerated for the sake of peace. As things indifferent the Church had the power to admit, to change, to abolish them; they do not stand in the way of the proper worship of God; by the admission of these indifferent things war might be averted; afflictions are to be borne where they cannot be declined without inviting greater evils and perils; their consciences would suffer if by rejecting these secondary matters the Church should be brought into great distress; many of these adiaphora were already in use in the dominions of the Elector.

Such are the main reasons advanced by the theologians of

thons, pp. 449, 450; Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Fourth Ed., vol. I., 284-5; Rietschel, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, I., 434-5, *notes*.

Wittenberg and Leipzig, for the toleration of the institutions sanctioned by the Leipzig Interim.*

Flacius and his Magdeburg helpers started from the principle that *in a case of confession and of scandal nothing is adiapheron*. Brentz took the position that adiaphora in themselves considered are neither good nor evil, but that it is the circumstances which determine whether they are good or evil. As an act of charity adiaphora may be tolerated. But they should be resisted when an effort is made to impose them; and also when the motive is fear or policy, for these show a lack of faith in the power of God to protect his Church; and likewise when they introduce offence, obscure the confession of the truth, and endanger Christian liberty, are they to be resisted.

Flacius maintained that the Interim was the work of antichrist, of the Babylonian harlot, and of the beast which the harlot bore. Here the Emperor and the Kings are the servants of antichrist, that is, of the Pope. The Princes are the servants of the Emperor and of King Ferdinand, and the older theologians in endorsing these changes simply yield to the courts and to the Princes. All these changes were concessions to the papal system, were introduced in opposition to the will of the Church, and had their foundation in hostility to the Church. The Church must fight for the liberty which she has through Christ. He declared that the theologians who favored the changes were inspired by fear and by the wisdom of this world.

There can be no doubt that the Saxon theologians were moved by the dread of impending war. How far they were justified, under the circumstances, in making the concessions which were made by them, cannot now be accurately determined. But there can be no doubt that the principles enunciated by their opponents embrace the true evangelical conception. Ceremonies that are not contrary to the Scriptures may be tolerated as things indifferent, but when they are required as a mark of distinction, or as a necessary adjunct of the proper worship of God, or are imposed by authority, they are to be resisted as things contrary to the Gospel. Such was the position taken at the beginning of the Reformation. Rites and ceremonies have no dogmatic significance. Liturgies and orders of worship were set forth as "*externi ritus*, outward works set forth in the Christian Church by pious, godly Christians, according to the

* Musaeus, *Praelectiones in epitomen Formulae Concordiae*, p. 328. Von Ranke, V., 59, especially *note* 1.

need or circumstances of persons and places by virtue of our Christian freedom." In the Wittenberg Order of 1533 it is expressly declared that "ceremonies are not necessary laws, but the pastor has the power to act in such matters as may serve for the best."* This has always been regarded as a fundamental principle in the Lutheran Church, and the practice of the Lutheran Church harmonizes with the principle. At Frankfort the Lutherans declined to inaugurate uniform ceremonies, for the two-fold reason that such an enactment is contrary to Christian liberty, and could not be enforced.†

But the Adiaphoristic Controversy lost its significance with the conclusion of the *Augsburg Religious Peace* of 1555, by which full religious freedom was granted to the adherents of the Augsburg Confession both in doctrine and in worship. And yet at the Diet of Worms in 1557, Adiaphorism was brought forward by the Flacianists as a subject to be condemned. In the *Formula Consensus,* written by Melanchthon at Worms in the same year, the *Interim* is expressly condemned.‡

3. *The Majoristic Controversy.*

George Major, born 1502, died 1574, some time professor and pastor at Wittenberg, advanced the proposition that *good works are necessary to salvation.* The proposition was based on the oft-repeated declaration of the older reformers that good works are the necessary fruits of justification, that is, that good works follow justification by an ethical necessity. Luther maintained that grace is a powerful, living, active thing, that leads, begets, works all things in man, and makes itself felt and experienced in man.§ And Melanchthon: "Eternal life is not bestowed on account of the excellence of good work. And yet good works are necessary to eternal life, because they ought necessarily to follow reconciliation."|| But by good works, Melanchthon meant not only civil duties, but such spiritual affections as the fear of God, confidence, worship, love and the like affections.

Major's formal declaration was: "I indeed confess that I

* Richard and Painter, *Christian Worship,* First Ed., pp. 212 *et seqq.*

† Hüffell, *Evang. Geistliche,* II., 111.

‡ C. R. IX., 293; 368. For the literature of this subject see Walch, *Einleitung,* IV., V., §§ xlviii.-lxviii. For the history see Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus,* I., 135 *et seqq.;* Planck, *Geschichte,* IV., 208 *et seqq.* Schlüsselburg, XIII., 71 *et seqq. Unschuldige Nachrichten, Anno* 1702, pp. 504 *et seqq.*

§ Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte,* II., 242-3.

|| C. R. IX., 429.

have hitherto taught and to the end of my life will teach as follows: That good works are necessary to salvation: Also that no one will ever be saved without good works: That, in a word, it is impossible for anyone to be saved without good works. Hence should anyone, even though he be an angel from heaven, teach otherwise, let him be anathema."* Melanchthon was satisfied with the propositions: "New obedience is necessary," and: "New obedience is a debt, for the reason that it is the unchangeable order that the rational creature obey God," and advised the omission of the words: "To salvation, because this addition points to merit, and obscures the doctrine of grace; for it abides true that man is righteous before God and is an heir of eternal salvation, out of grace, for the sake of Christ, alone through faith in him."†

The proposition of Major was opposed by Nicholas von Amsdorf, who declared that "whoever should teach and preach that good works are necessary to salvation is a Pelagian, a Mameluke, and a denier of Christ, and has the same spirit as Mensing and Witzel, who defended the same proposition against Dr. Martin of holy memory." He also declared that Major had the spirit and the mind of the Papists, and that his proposition is godless, dangerous and suspicious.‡ Finally he even went so far as to declare that good works are injurious to salvation, and that both Paul and Luther had so taught and preached.§ This in the year 1559. And yet earlier he had declared: "I have always taught that we ought to perform good works."||

Flacius also engaged in the controversy with his usual sarcasm and scurrility. In one of his attacks he calls Major the greatest reconciler of Christ and Belial, or antichrist and champion of the New Interims. Another article he entitles: *Against the Evangelist of the Holy Chorrock, Dr. Geitz Major.*¶ And in his *Censure of the Last Will of Dr. Major* he declares that "the Papists teach more correctly in regard to good works than the Majorists."**

The clergy of Lübeck, Hamburg, Lüneburg and Magdeburg united in an *Opinion* against Major's proposition. They declare that it is dangerous and absurd to teach that good works

* Schlüsselburg, VII., 30. See also Preger, *ut supra*, I., 357 *et seqq.*, 361.
† C. R. IX., 497-9.
‡ Schlüsselburg, VII., 210.
§ Salig, I., 642; Thomasius, II., 482.
|| C. R. IX., 843.
¶ Preger, I., *ut supra*, 361; II., 550.
** Schlüsselburg, VII., 266 *et seqq.*

are necessary to salvation, though they confess that good works follow faith spontaneously, just as the good tree spontaneously brings forth good fruits.* Also the Mansfeld theologians wrote an *Opinion and Confession* in which they declare that Major's proposition obscures the doctrine of God's grace and Christ's merit.† A Synod at Eisenach, 1556, pronounced Major's proposition false *in foro justificationis,* but allowable *in foro legis.* Very generally the proposition was condemned, though a few individuals defended it.‡

The question at issue was really this: Are men justified by faith alone, without works, for the sake of Christ? Major answered that men are justified by faith alone, without works, for the sake of Christ. But he did not distinguish sufficiently between justification and renovation, or between Christ *for* us and the Holy Spirit *in* us as the result of justification. He identified salvification and justification. He says that salvification in this life "consists in the remission of sins and in the imputation of righteousness, in the gift and renovation of the Holy Spirit and in the hope of eternal life freely bestowed for the sake of Christ. This salvification and justification are only begun and imperfect: Because in those who are saved by faith and justified, there still remain sin, the depravity of nature, the terrors of sin and of the law, the bite of the old serpent, death and all human miseries; and thus by faith and by the Holy Spirit we begin to be justified, to be sanctified and saved. We are not yet perfectly justified and saved. It remains, therefore, that we be perfectly justified and saved." § He established no causal relation between justification and good works. But by and by he modified his proposition so as to read: "Good works are necessary for retaining salvation." ||

And now turning our eyes back so as to review for a moment the controversies described briefly in Chapters XX., XXI., XXII., we find that they are not all connected with specific

* Schlüsselburg, VII., 592, 603, 604.

† Schlüsselburg, VII., 222 *et seqq.*

‡ For the literature on the subject, see Schlüsselburg, vol. VII.; Walch, *Einleitung,* IV., V., 188 *et seqq.;* Planck, IV., 570 *et seqq.;* Salig, I., 637 *et seqq.*

§ Schlüsselburg, VII., 348.

|| Planck, IV., V., 545. Melanchthon earnestly counselled that the proposition: "Good works are necessary to Salvation," be dropped, because it was abused by the Papists. C. R. VIII., p. 194. In his letter to the Senate of Nordhausen, January 13, 1555, he advises the preachers to cease discussing Dr. Major and his affairs from the pulpit. The proposition is ambiguous and the dispute has long disturbed the Church. C. R. VIII., 410. Gieseler, IV., 438, note 13.

parties in the Lutheran Church. Some of them are to be regarded rather as phenomena in the Lutheran Church, such as might arise at any time and be discussed for awhile, only to disappear again. Such was the dispute with Osiander, which lasted from 1549 to 1557, in which Melanchthon and Flacius were on the same side. The same is true in regard to the error of Stancar. The adiaphoristic controversy began to disappear with the conclusion of the Religious Peace of Augsburg in 1555. The Controversy on Free-will, which began in 1555, and was the most bitter of all the Lutheran controversies, lasted till 1567.* That on original sin began in 1560 and lasted till 1575. The Majoristic, or that on the necessity of good works to salvation, which by way of reaction brought up again the Antinomian Controversy, extended from 1551 to 1562, though echoes of some of these controversies continued to be heard at intervals even after they had lost their significance for the Church in general.

Hence in the eighth decade of the sixteenth century, the only existing controversies of real significance to the Lutheran Church was that on the Lord's Supper, chiefly as it was connected with the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*, and that on Free-will.† The controversies, other than these two, had virtually run their course, before or early in the beginning of the eighth decade of the century, and had died, or were dying, a natural death, though many alienations yet existed. But it cannot be denied that the sixth, seventh and eighth decades of the century mark a period of burning strife in the Lutheran Church. The amount of bitterness, estrangement, suspicion and persecution engendered by those controversies, cannot be understood until one has read a large amount of the polemical literature of the times. The language employed in many instances was that of caricature, denunciation and slander. Some even doubted whether their opponents could be saved. Some were imprisoned, and some were banished, simply

* This is the date usually given by historians for the cessation of the controversy on Free-will (Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, I., 270); yet as a matter of fact loud echoes of the controversy still lingered. It was scheduled for discussion at the Altenburg Colloquy. The Saxon Universities declare themselves most decidedly against the Flacian views, and repeat the views that had been enunciated and maintained by Melanchthon. See *Endlicher Bericht*, fol. 70 *et seqq.* Also Gieseler, *Church History*, IV., 482. In the *Confessio Wittenbergica*, 1570, we have the Melanchthonian view in clear and distinct expression.

† Gieseler, *Church History*, IV., 481-2. It cannot be said that there was a perfect understanding in regard to Justification.

because their theological views did not please a ruler or his narrow-minded and vindictive courtiers. And the whole distress was aggravated by reason of the territorial divisions of Germany, and by the jealousies of the Princes, their rivalries of each other, and their atrocious tryanny. In many cases where the Princes were *summi episcopi* of the Church they both used and abused their power for the promotion of political aims and ends. Too frequently they cared for their own things and not for the things of Christ and of his Church. As a consequence of the prevailing spirit of strife and of the political divisions and antagonisms the Lutheran Church in Germany was weak where it ought to have been strong. Instead of confounding her enemy by a bold and united front, she excited the ridicule and contempt of her enemy by her divisions and internecine contentions. It was the fabled fight of the Cadmean brothers enacted with terrible reality in the Lutheran Church. Notwithstanding the Religious Peace of Augsburg, the Lutheran Church was growing weaker, and the Roman Catholic Church was growing stronger.

Was this the legitimate outcome of what the Lutherans did at Augsburg in 1530 when the Lutheran Church was born? By no means. Had the spirit that prevailed at Augsburg in 1530 continued to prevail, and the spirit that created and sustained the Schmalkald League, the divisions and distractions and alienations of the sixth, seventh and eighth decades of the sixteenth century could not have entered the Lutheran Church. The condition of affairs that confronts us is due primarily to the worldly ambitions of Princes, and secondarily, to the jealousies of a few theologians. Maurice and some others betrayed the interests of Lutheranism, and brought on the catastrophe of Mühlberg. This was followed by the two Interims which were preëminently the work of the Princes and their counsellors.

Already before the death of Luther the growing influence of Melanchthon in the Church, and Luther's avowed esteem for him, had excited the jealousy of such men as John Agricola and Nicholas von Amsdorf. They did not like to see Master Philip preferred to themselves. The fortunes of the Schmalkald War, which had left Melanchthon and so many of his pupils in place at Wittenberg and Leipzig, and had driven others into exile—"exiles of Christ," "exiles of God"—had aroused the feeling of jealousy and antipathy in the breasts of such men as Nicholas Gallus, Matthew Judex, John Wigand and others of similar fate

and temperament. All these were led by Flacius, whose nature was ever for war and never for peace. In their reaction against Melanchthon, and in their just hate of Maurice, they called Luther "the third Elias," "the prophet of God," and without qualification they called Luther's doctrine "the doctrine of Christ."* But they took as their premises some of Luther's extreme and incidental sentences and propositions, and drew from them conclusions, and constructed upon them arguments, from which Luther would have turned with reprehension, as for instance that sin is the very essence of man, that good works are detrimental to salvation, that the human nature of Christ is ubiquitous, that the law has no authority over Christians.

These are some of the un-Lutheran extremes to which some of the anti-Melanchthon leaders were driven by their modes of argumentation and by their partisanism. We do not say that they did no good by their contentions. Already we have said that they did good service in the Interimistic Controversy. But the amount of good done by them is vastly outweighed by the evil done by them. They not only introduced a spirit of controversy into the Lutheran Church, which still lives and from time to time incites to internecine strife; but by their one-sided and exaggerated Lutherism they promoted a one-sided and exaggerated Melanchthonism. Their supreme aim was to destroy Melanchthon's influence in the Church which he had helped to create, and to enthrone the Luther of their own narrowed polemical conceptions as autocrat on the throne of the Lutheran Church. But Luther and Melanchthon were too deeply imbedded in the heart of the German people to be sundered by malice and detraction—the great-souled Luther from the tender-hearted Melanchthon, the prophet from the preceptor, the man of war from the man of peace. Historical retribution hung in the air, and soon it descended upon those who had been most active in strifes and contentions. Melanchthonism was rehabilitated—not fully, but it has been restored to an honorable place by the side of Lutherism. Whither the one goes, the other goes, where the one lodges, the other lodges. Together they constitute Lutheranism *qui manet in aeternum.*

* *Magdeburg Confession.*

CHAPTER XXIII.

EFFORTS AT PACIFICATION.

The controversies, distractions and alienations described in the four preceding chapters created a feeling of sadness in the hearts of all true disciples of Luther and Melanchthon. Even the Princes, not a few of whom cared more for themselves than for the Church, lamented the situation. By the close of the sixties and at the beginning of the seventies the feeling prevailed widely that efforts should be made to restore concord. Fortunately there were learned theologians who had taken little or no part in the controversies. Among these were Jacob Andreae of Tübingen, Martin Chemnitz of Brunswick, David Chytraeus of Rostock, and, with some qualifications, Nicholas Selneccer of Leipzig, then of Wolfenbüttel, then of Leipzig again. Also there were Princes who had had little or no association with the rivalries and quarrels of the Saxons, such as Duke Julius of Brunswick, Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, Landgrave William of Hesse-Cassel, and Prince George Ernest of Henneberg. These were subsequently joined by Augustus of Saxony, and John George of Brandenburg. But it was not easy to make a beginning, though it was plainly seen that at least three things must be included in any peace negotiations that were expected to bring permanent concord. First: All good and true Lutherans, and all good and true Melanchthonians must be separated from those of both sides who had gone to incorrigible extremes. Secondly: That the unreduced differences in regard to Justification, Free-will and the Person of Christ must be eliminated. Thirdly: That Crypto-Calvinism, which had crept into parts of the Lutheran Church, must be expelled.

At first, efforts at pacification were made by those who had been most violently engaged in controversy, as for instance, at the Diet of Worms in 1557. Here the method adopted by the Flacianists was by introducing wholesale condemnations of those charged with deviations from the Lutheran doctrines. But this method not only failed; it widened the breach. At Frankfort the next year a better method was adopted. On the basis

of the Scriptures, the three Ecumenical Creeds, the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, the assembled Princes set forth "a summary and body of doctrine," which was to be preached and taught in their churches in opposition to erroneous opinions and to those sects which resisted the truth. Only four Articles are treated, viz., Justification before God, the Relation of Good Works to Salvation, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, Adiaphora in the Church. Though the Frankfort Recess was signed by three Electors, one Count, the Duke of Würtemberg, and the Landgrave of Hesse, yet its only effect was that it called forth the Weimar *Confutation Book*.* The Naumburg Diet of Princes, which was undertaken for the purpose of uniting all the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, left no permanent results in the direction of Lutheran union.

The times were not yet ripe for concord. So long as John Frederick the Second continued to be Duke of Saxony, and while Flacianism yet reigned at Jena and at the Weimar court, concord could not be effected. And neither side, neither the Flacianists nor the Philippists, had reached the conclusions involved in their own premises. Hence neither side was conquered, and neither side was ready to lay down its arms. But passing years brought political, ecclesiastical and theological changes, and with these changes obstacles to Lutheran concord began to disappear, though even in the late sixties and in the early seventies there was no abatement of fury between the ducal and the electoral theologians, as witness the Altenburg Colloquy (1568-9) and the *Corpus Thuringicum* (1571).

1. *Wittenberg and Zerbst.*

All beginnings are difficult. But gradually the theologians and the Princes who had not been involved, at least, not seriously, in the controversies and rivalries of the times, contrived, at first obscurely and tentatively, to inaugurate measures of pacification. Already in 1562 Jacob Andreae had mediated in Thuringia. But the real beginning of pacificatory efforts are to be connected with the Visitation of the Brunswick lands ordered by Duke Julius in 1568, and conducted by Andreae and Chemnitz, who together composed the Brunswick Church Order of 1569, which has as doctrinal basis or *Corpus Doctrinae*, besides the Holy Scriptures and the three Ecumenical Creeds, the Augs-

* See C. R. IX., 489 *et seqq.*

burg Confession as explained in the Apology, in the Schmalkald Articles, in the Catechism and in Luther's writings.

During the Visitation Andreae interested Duke Julius in his plans for Lutheran pacification, and showed him the articles which he had brought with him from Swabia and which treated *Of Justification by Faith; of Good Works; Of Free-will; Of Adiaphora; Of the Lord's Supper.* When the Duke suggested that some of his propositions were too severe, Andreae modified them,* and January 9, 1569, he came to Wittenberg. Here he met George Major and found him favorable to his plans of pacification. Subsequently he visited numerous lands and found general approval of his plans of pacification. In the Summer of the same year he visited the Elector of Saxony with letters of commendation from Duke Julius and Landgrave William of Hesse.† The Elector was so pleased with his plans and propositions that he sent him to Wittenberg with a letter commanding the theologians there to confer with him on the subject of unity in the Lutheran Church.‡ He arrived at Wittenberg, August 12th, and on the 18th he held an interview with the theologians, who told him that the only basis of agreement was the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum.* On the eleventh Sunday after Trinity, from the pulpit of the city church, he declared his agreement with the Wittenbergers in all the articles of faith, and said: Symbolum nostri consensus debet esse Corpus doctrinae vestrarum ecclesiarum, and again: "I will stake my life on your *Corpus Doctrinae.*" §

The Wittenbergers expressed their delight with Andreae's sermon, "and in the most friendly and fraternal manner with prayer sent him on his mission in the name of the Almighty God." The Wittenbergers also gave him a testimonial,|| in which they refer to their *Corpus Doctrinae* and to Andreae's

* See Johannsen in *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theologie*, 1853, p. 346. Schütz, *Vita D. Chytraei*, II., 162 *et seqq.* The Articles in Hutter, Cap. II., and in Heppe, II., 251 *et seqq.*

† Walch, *Introductio*, p. 709.

‡ Letter in Hutter, Cap. II., p. 16*b*.

§ Johannsen, *ut supra*, p. 352; Calinich, pp. 20, 34; Walch, *Introductio*, p. 709. Also Andreae's *Bericht*, from which almost everything contained in this section is taken in condensed form. *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, Anno 1718, p. 221. See also Andreae's letters to Landgrave William of Hesse in Neudecker's *Neue Beiträge*, pp. 160, 172, 183, 187. In these letters we have accounts, in some cases minute, of Andreae's movements and of his theological position in these initial efforts of pacification. When Andreae visited Wittenberg the first time all the Wittenberg theologians, except Major, were attending the Altenburg Colloquy.

|| Hutter, pp. 31-32; Calinich, *ut supra*, p. 20.

sermon, though they do not express a judgment on his articles, and subsequently they expressed themselves emphatically against the doctrine of ubiquity.

Leaving Wittenberg, Andreae visited in quick succession the principal rulers of Northern Germany and Lower Saxony, and the maritime cities, including also the widowed queen, Dorothea, of Denmark and Norway. He reports that he found the preachers and the teachers unanimous in their approval of his articles as in fundamental agreement with the Augsburg Confession. Finally he went to Weimar. Here he was violently denounced from the court pulpit by Tilemann Heshuss as one "who has before him the ungodly purpose of uniting Christ and Belial, light and darkness, lies and truth, righteousness and unrighteousness, God and the devil, in one mass." He also warns the people, high and low, against Andreae, "as against the devil, who, by his conciliations, has already harassed the poor Church of Christ in many places." And the Jena theologians, even before they had heard Andreae, or had received a report of his work, published manifestoes, in which they declare their faith, and denounce Andreae, heaping upon him such nicknames and invectives in barbarous German, and in other barbarous linguistic compounds, as do show that their authors were malignant at heart. Andreae had agreed with the Wittenbergers. That was the unpardonable sin. The Weimarians would not agree with him, lest they show to all the world that their accusations of the Wittenbergers had been false and groundless.*

But Andreae was so encouraged by the reception accorded him in Northern Germany and in Lower Saxony, that he proposed to the Princes that they call a conference of theologians who should consider his projects of union. Accordingly, a conference was called, chiefly at the instance of Duke Julius and the Landgrave of Hesse. Andreae was commissioned to name the theologians who should be sent to the Conference. May 7 (1570) the Conference met at Zerbst in Anhalt, with twenty-one theologians present representing the Elector of Saxony, the Duke of Brunswick, the Landgrave of Hesse, Margrave John of Brandenburg, the Princes of Anhalt and the cities of Lower Saxony. The next day they agreed on the Scriptures, the three

* Calinich, pp. 20-24; Johannsen, p. 355; Rehtmeyer, III., Beylagen, pp. 173-5; Gieseler, IV., p. 465; Andreae's *Bericht, litera* H, pp. ii. *et seqq.* Heshuss's sermon was printed at Jena in 1570. See Lentz, *Geschichte der Christlichen Homiletik,* who gives extracts, II., 51-4.

ancient Creeds, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the other writings embraced in the *Corpus Doctrinae* and the writings of Luther as a norm of doctrine.* But this norm in reality marks no advance in the direction of pacification. It explained nothing; it created nothing; it left things exactly where they had been. The Wittenbergers would not give up their *Corpus Doctrinae,* and they formally declared that they received the new norm only in so far as it agrees with their *Corpus Doctrinae.*

Andreae then made a *Report* (*Bericht*) to the Emperor and Princes on his pacification efforts. He represents that "at Zerbst Christian unity has been attained," expresses his satisfaction with the views of the Wittenbergers on the person of Christ, says that "all the articles of the Augsburg Confession are explained in a Christian manner in the writings of Dr. Luther, of Master Philip Melanchthon, especially in the book printed under the title *Corpus Doctrinae,* and in his other useful and glorious writings, and in the writings of Brentz, and others;" calls "Luther and Melanchthon our dear fathers and preceptors."

To this *Report* the Leipzig and Wittenberg theologians make reply to the effect that Andreae has placed them in a false light before the world; that his declaration that there is fundamental agreement between themselves and the Flacianists, "is a golden dream": that his plan of pacification is only *cura palliativa;* that he has introduced into Saxony a controversy on the *Communicatio Idiomatum;* that he has changed his articles time and again, so as to suit the people to whom he presents them; that his articles are imperfect, and agree more nearly with the doctrine of the Flacianists than with that of the Church. They remind him that while they had referred to his sermon, delivered at Wittenberg, they had not rendered an opinion on his articles; say that the convention at Zerbst was wholly *insidiose;* that the reconciliation of which he had boasted had not taken place; that if their *Corpus Doctrinae* be found wanting they are ready to make an explanation; that the matter of pacification is both difficult and dangerous.

Of Andreae's Report we may say that it is aglow with expectation. It is evident that he does not comprehend the depth

* Köllner, *Symbolik,* I., 538, note 15. See *Unschuldige Nachrichten,* 1704, pp. 23-27, for the *Recess* of the Convention. By Luther's writings are meant the Catechism and the Schmalkald Articles, as we learn from Andreae's *Bericht.* The *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* was not itself made normative.

and the bitterness of the estrangement. The reply of the Leipzig and Wittenberg theologians rightly calls his plan *cura palliativa*, though its theology is characterized by the Swabian tendency. Here ended Andreae's first effort at pacification. The Weimarians and the Wittenbergers have alike repudiated him.

2. *Andreae's Six Sermons.*

After the failure of the Zerbst convention to effect pacification, Andreae returned to Würtemberg and engaged in various ecclesiastical activities; but he did not lose sight of his pacification projects. He only changed his plans. He determined to turn away from the Wittenbergers, to conciliate their enemies, and to strive especially to bring the Lutherans of Swabia into formal concord with the Lutherans of Lower Saxony, and to unite both against Zwinglianism, Calvinism and Philippism. A favorable opportunity for a beginning, according to this new conception, was furnished in the Autumn of 1572, when Nicholas Selneccer, Superintendent at Wolfenbüttel, sent him a copy of the first volume of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* This book Selneccer had dedicated to the Duke of Würtemberg, and had affirmed in the dedication the agreement of the churches of the Duchy of Brunswick with those of Würtenberg in confession. He also praises the writings of Brentz almost above limit, and lauds the service of "the reverend and most celebrated man, Dr. Jacob Andreae, in properly organizing and establishing the churches in this Duchy."

This work by Selneccer, though prevailingly Melanchthonian throughout, and decidedly so on the doctrine of Free-will, nevertheless incited Andreae to compose *Six Christian Sermons on the Divisions which have gradually arisen between the Theologians of the Augsburg Confession from the Year 1548 to the Year 1573.* Showing how a plain Pastor and a Common Christian Layman, who have been troubled thereat, may adjust themselves by means of the Catechism. By Dr. Jacob Andreae, Provost at Tübingen and Chancellor of the University there. The content of each Sermon, Christian Reader, you will find below. Printed at Tübingen. By George Gruppenbach.*

The substance of these Six Sermons is as follows:

I. Of the Righteousness of Faith Before God.

How are we to understand the proposition, the righteous-

* Reprinted by Heppe, III., Beilage, No. I.

ness of Christ which is reckoned to us by faith? Some understand it of the divine nature, that is, of the essential righteousness of Christ as Christ is true God. Others understand it of the human nature which Christ received from the Virgin Mary. Others understand by it the obedience which Christ rendered to his heavenly Father under the law. This third view is taught in the Scriptures, which employ the word "justify" in the sense of declaring righteous, absolving from unrighteousness. In the righteousness of faith three things go together, and unless all are present no one is justified: "First, the pure grace of God. Secondly, the obedience or merit of Christ. Thirdly, Faith. For where there is no grace of God the Father, there there is neither the merit of Christ nor faith. Again: Where we do not have Christ in his obedience, there we can hope for no grace of God. Also: Where there is no faith, there neither the grace of God nor the obedience of Christ is of any avail. Therefore in the justification of a poor sinner before God these three things belong together: The grace of God, the obedience of Christ and true faith. For God is gracious alone for the sake of Christ through faith."

A plain layman should say: "I believe the forgiveness of sins," and he should cling to the faith of his childhood that our righteousness before God is not the essential righteousness of God, but the obedience of Christ, the Son of God and the Son of man, who has furnished our righteousness before God. This righteousness is appropriated by faith. Such is the chief article of our faith, namely, that our righteousness consists not in our own works, nor in the indwelling of the essential righteousness of God; "but it is to be sought alone in the obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is reckoned to us through faith and for whose sake alone all our sins are removed and cancelled."

II. Of Good Works.

One party says that good works are necessary to salvation and that it is impossible to be saved without good works. The other party says that good works are not only not necessary, but are detrimental to salvation. The plain layman must turn to the Lord Jesus whose work alone, alone, alone, is necessary to salvation. This is the old Christian faith. The proposition: Good works are necessary to salvation savors of the condemned doctrine of the papacy. The proposition that good works are detrimental to salvation is Epicurean.

These dangerous and offensive propositions should be excluded from the Church. The people should rely on the safe words of the Holy Scriptures.

III. Of the Controversy over Original Sin and Free-will.

One party holds and teaches that original sin is not something in man's nature, but that it is man's nature itself, his rational soul, which since the Fall of our first parents is the creature and work of the devil. This view is founded on those passages of Scripture in which man is compared to thorns, and thistles, and his heart is likened to a hard stone and to an evil tree which has entirely lost its good essence.

The other party holds that original sin is not the nature or essence of man, but something accidental in man's soul, and that man, his nature, his body and soul, are one entity, and that sin in man, in his body and soul, is a different thing. A distinction must be made: Adam, before the Fall, was without sin. Adam, after the Fall, is a sinner. Before the resurrection Adam still has sin, after the resurrection he is without sin. Yet there is only one Adam in nature and in essence, and not one Adam who has sinned and another who has done that which is right. Paul makes a clear distinction between the essence and the sin. He does not say that "he or his essence is sin, but that sin is in him, and clings to him, and that he longs to be free from sin."

A second question is, How far does sin extend in man, especially in relation to spiritual matters and in relation to his conversion to God, or whether in spiritual matters he can do anything of himself or not? Some hold that though man has by birth a corrupted and perverted nature, yet when the Holy Spirit comes with his power, and helps and strengthens the remaining powers of man, man can, by the power of Free-will remaining, with the help and assistance of the Holy Spirit turn himself to God, "for man is not a block or a stone, but though unregenerate he has a rational soul, reason and understanding, and can in some sense distinguish between good and evil. Hence he is without excuse. Such is the meaning of all those passages of Scripture in which God complains that man will not; and Christ himself laments over Jerusalem: How oft would I have gathered thy children as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wing, and ye would not. If there were no help and assistance of God, but complaint was made against man's will, that

he will not, the complaint would be without meaning if man had no will to turn to God."

The other party holds that Free-will is merely a name, and has been entirely destroyed, and is stark blind. God works conversion by the preaching of the Gospel, which must be heard by the bodily ears. Now as regards this instrument of the Holy Spirit, the preaching of the Gospel, there is a great difference between a block or a clod and an unconverted man. For man is a rational creature and hears the Gospel. A block and a clod are not rational, and cannot hear. The order of God is that we hear the Word of Christ: O Jerusalem, how oft would I, and ye would not. "When God requires obedience man can and ought to render it. But to understand and to believe the Gospel is the work of the Holy Spirit, who through the Word preached works all such in the hearts of the elect."

IV. Of Adiaphora.

The question is, Whether at a time in which one is required to make a confession of his faith, he can, with a good conscience, permit the restoration of lapsed or abandoned Church usages in order to please the enemies of God's Word? One party held that this can and may be done. The other party contended that at such a time and in such a case we should not yield in the smallest thing to the enemies of God's Word. The plain layman should take the position that what is necessary God has enjoined in his Word, and that what he has not enjoined is not necessary. The Christian should stand fast in the liberty wherewith God has made him free. But the papal unction, consecration, confirmation and the Mass are papal errors which should be avoided.

V. Of the Difference Between the Law and the Gospel.

The question is, Should the Law, that is, the Ten Commandments, with the penalties and threats attached thereto, be applied to Christians? One party maintains that the Law has to do with the Jews, and not with the Christians. The other party, following Luther, teaches that the Law has been in existence from the beginning of the world and must be employed in the Christian Church. Christ has commanded the preaching of the Law and of the Gospel. "The end of Law is Christ, Rom. 10, and there is not one God in the Gospel and another in the

Law, for there is only one eternal God, who through the Law in the first Commandment requires faith, and through the Gospel gives it."

There is also the question about the third use of the Law. Do Christians need the Law as a rule by which to guide their lives? The one party holds that the Christian does not need the Law, since of himself he does that which is right. The other party holds that the righteous, the regenerate, need the Law so as daily to learn the will of God.

In so far as the believer is regenerate, he follows the Holy Spirit who is in him as the rule of righteousness and holiness. But in so far as he is not regenerate, the Holy Spirit uses the doctrines and admonitions of the Law, from obedience to which the believer is not absolved.

This also brings in the question of Good Works. One party maintains that though Good Works are not necessary to salvation, yet it is necessary that we do good works, inasmuch as the creature ought to obey the Creator. The other party has maintained that good works are not necessary, but they ought to be done with a free spirit. Believers in this world do good works, not only because God has appointed that they should be done, but he does them from a free spirit. In so far as he is born again he does good works voluntarily. In so far as he still has a corrupt nature he is constrained to bring all his powers into obedience to Christ.

VI. Of the Person and Two Natures, Divine and Human, of Our Lord.

The questions involved in this tenth controversy arose with Zwingli's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, in which it is maintained that in the Lord's Supper there is only bread and wine, and not the body and blood of Christ. The real question now is, "Does the human nature in Christ, which has its own essence and attributes, in fact and in reality have a true fellowship with the divine nature and its attributes?" The New Wittenbergers following Zwingli hold that the human nature has in fact and in reality nothing in common with the divine nature except the name. These new Wittenberg theologians hold with Luther the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, but they reject and condemn Luther's doctrine of the person of Christ. Luther and Brentz refuted the doctrine of Zwingli.

A common layman must appeal to the Apostles' Creed: "Our Christ." "The Son of God is the second person of the Trinity and has a divine nature in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit. All the attributes of the divine nature were appropriated by the human nature of Christ in the womb of the Virgin Mary." The question now is, What did the Son of God impart to the human by the personal union? The Wittenbergers say that he imparted nothing to it, neither his divine nature, nor his person, nor his divine attributes, such as omnipotence, infinite wisdom, as infinite power and the like. The Christian faith teaches "that the only begotten Son of God was for thy sake conceived in the womb of the Virgin Mary, was born of her, suffered under Pontius Pilate, died, descended into hell, rose again, etc."

These new theologians teach that only the attributes of Christ's human nature were born, suffered, died, rose again, and that the Son of God had no true fellowship with the human nature, neither as regards his divine nature, nor as regards his person, his attributes, his majesty, his works. If this be so, then how can it be said truly that the only begotten Son was born of a woman for us, and suffered, and that we are redeemed by the blood of God? The New Wittenbergers deny a true doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum,* and call it only an interchange of names. But by the personal union of the two natures of Christ is meant that the entire Godhead and all its fulness dwells bodily in the human nature of Christ. Then is the man Christ capable of the Godhead, and "the human nature is truly ingrafted into the divine majesty of the Son of God."

The Wittenbergers say: "In Christ dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, but not in the human nature of Christ. There has never been a teacher in all Christendom who so believed and taught. When they speak of the indwelling of God in Christ, they always understand it of his humanity, that is, in Christ according to his humanity, or that in his human nature dwells the fulness of the divine nature bodily. Hence they explain the word bodily as equivalent to in his own body."

"In Christ is one only divine omnipotence, namely, the eternal divine omnipotence which is peculiar to the divine nature. This the human nature has in common with the Godhead in such form that the Godhead and the humanity are indeed and in truth one person."

These sermons are addressed to the plain pastor and to the

common layman, rather than to the theologian. They embrace, on the basis of the Augsburg Confession, that which for the most part is common to evangelical Lutheranism. The third sermon presents essentially the Melanchthonian doctrine of Free-will, as that doctrine had been again and again expounded by Melanchthon, especially in the Apology, to which he adhered to the end of his life, and also as that doctrine is presented in the *Reply to the Bavarain Articles,* which he set forth as a kind of final confession of his faith.* By no means is man regarded in this third sermon as purely passive in conversion to God, or as a stock or a stone, but as a rational soul: *I would, but ye would not.*

In the sixth sermon the Swabian Christology comes distinctly into view, namely, the doctrine that by the incarnation of the Son of God divine attributes are imparted to the human nature of Christ, such as omnipotence and omniscience. But the allegation that the Wittenberg theologians are "new Zwinglians," and that they have repristinated the Zwinglian Alöosis, is a slander which accords well with the prevalent polemical habit of that age, which was first to brand an opponent with an invidious epithet, or to align him with a notorious heretic, and then to condemn him. The Wittenberg theologians held no such doctrine of the Person of Christ as Andreae alleges. They held the doctrine as contained in their *Corpus,* in the older symbols and in the writings of Luther, that in the person of Christ the divine and the human nature are inseparably united, and that "His human nature is exalted far, far above all other creatures, angels and men. The Man Christ is the Son of God; all the properties of the divine nature belong to the Man Christ *in concreto.*" † But it was only by turning against the Philippists that Andreae could hope to secure the assistance of the Ubiquitarians and the Flacianists for his efforts at Pacification.

These Six Sermons, with a Preface dedicated to Duke Julius, February 17, 1573, and commended by the theological faculty of Tübingen, Andreae sent to the Duke, to Chemnitz, to Chytraeus, to Heshuss, Wigand and other theologians whom he knew to be interested in the work of concord,‡ with the request

* This *Reply* is given in the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum.* See C. R. IX., 1099, where Melanchthon says: "Volo tamen confessionem meam esse, Responsiones de Bavaricis articulis contra Pontificios, Anabaptistas Flacianos et similes." Compare the Preface (Latin), to the *Corpus Doctrinae,* next to the last paragraph.

† Calinich, *ut supra,* pp. 26, 27.

‡ Heppe, *ut supra,* III., 36-39; Kolde, *Einleitung,* LXIX.

that they be accepted as a basis of concord. But it was soon discovered that the sermonic form was not suited for a confession. Consequently Chemnitz suggested to Andreae, through Duke Julius, that the contents of the Sermons should be changed into articles with thesis and antithesis.*

3. *The Swabian Concordia.*

Andreae adopted the suggestion of Chemnitz and in a short time prepared what is known as *The Swabian Concordia.* This formula consists of eleven articles, as follows: 1. Of Original Sin, 2. Of Free-will, 3. Of the Righteousness of Faith before God, 4. Of Good Works, 5. Of the Law and the Gospel, 6. Of the Third use of the Law of God, 7. Of Church Usages which are called Adiaphora or Things Indifferent, 8. Of the Lord's Supper, 9. Of the Person of Christ, 10. Of the Eternal Providence and Election of God, 11. Of other Factions and Sects.

On the twenty-second of March, 1574, this formula, approved by the theological faculty of Tübingen and by the Consistorium of Stuttgart, was sent to Duke Julius. In substance this *Explication of the Controversies* (sometimes called the *Tübingen Book),* which had arisen among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, was simply an elaboration of the Six Sermons with the addition of the last two articles. On the twelfth of May the Duke commanded Chemnitz to render an opinion on the book, and also ordered him to lay it before the clergy of Brunswick, and to obtain their opinion. Chemnitz, in his ardent longing for pacification, took up the matter in all earnestness and sent the *Explication* to the chief ministers of Lower Saxony; and the Duke urged the Princes and burgomasters and counsellors in all Lower Saxony to unite on the clear content of the Holy Scriptures, of the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Catechisms of Luther and the Schmalkald Articles, and prayed them to have their theologians consult with Chemnitz on the work of concord. Numerous synods and conferences were held in Lower Saxony, with the general result that Andreae's *Explication* was not found to be entirely satisfactory. Finally, in April, 1575, the theological Faculty of Rostock, having come into possession of the criticisms of Chemnitz and of some of the conferences, began the formal revision of Andreae's work. The articles on the Lord's Supper and Free-will were completely re-written by Chytraeus, and in general the Swabian *Explica-*

* *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theologie,* 1866, p. 231. The Duke's *Letter.*

tion was so much changed as to become almost an entirely new work.*

4. *The Swabian-Saxon Concordia.*

The Swabian Concordia, revised and changed as noted above, is known as the *Swabian-Saxon Concordia.*

The Concordia in this form takes as its doctrinal basis or *corpus doctrinae*, the Prophetical and Apostolic Scriptures, the three Ancient Creeds, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles and Luther's two Catechisms. It discusses the following articles in the following order: 1. *Of Original Sin*, 2. *Of the Person of Christ*, 3. *Of the Righteousness of Faith before God*, 4. *Of Good Works*, 5. *Of the Law and the Gospel*, 6. *Of the Third Use of the Law of God*, 7. *Of the Holy Supper*, 8. *Of God's Eternal Providence and Election*, 9. *Of Church Usages which are called Adiaphora or Things Indifferent*, 10. *Of Free-will or Human Powers*, 11. *Of Other Factions and Sects which have never Acknowledged the Augsburg Confession.*†

This concordia was sent to various lands and cities in Lower Saxony for approval and subscription. Some of these, also the Universities of Rostock and Helmstädt, subscribed it. Others raised objections. Then additional changes and revisions were made, chiefly by Chemnitz.‡

Finally, at the beginning of September, 1575, the new formula was sent to Andreae, accompanied by a letter from Chemnitz, which explains as diplomatically as possible the difficulties which had stood in the way of concord between the Saxon and neighboring churches, and urges Andreae to lay the Formula before the Würtemberg theologians for examination, and to report their desideria as soon as possible.§ But the new formula had been so changed by the theologians of Lower Saxony, that Andreae could scarcely recognize any part of it as his own work. In a letter to the Elector of Saxony he complains of the lack of uniformity in the style of composition, of the introduction of so many Latin scholastic terms, and of so many Latin

* For the details touching the *Swabian Concordia*, see Rehtmeyer, III., 440 *et seqq.*; Löscher, *Historia Motuum*, III., 246 *et seqq.*; Planck, VI., 414 *et seqq.*; *Heppe, ut supra*, III., 239-258; Kolde, *Einleitung*, LXIX.; *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theologie*, 1866, pp. 230 *et seqq.*

† Given by Pfaff in *Acta et Scripta*, pp. 381 *et seqq.*, and by Heppe, *ut supra*, III., 166-325, under the title: *Formula Concordiae inter Suevicas et Saxonicas Ecclesias.*

‡ Planck, VI., 418; Heppe, III., 53 *et seqq.*

§ See Chemnitz's letter in Pfaff's *Acta et Scripta*, pp. 516 *et seqq.*

quotations from the Fathers, of quoting Melanchthon in one place with approbation and in another with censure, and of the excessive use of Luther's polemical writings against the Sacramentarians in the article on the Lord's Supper.*

Certain it is that this revised formula lacks the simplicity and the symmetry that had characterized both the *Six Sermons* and the *Explication* of Andreae, who sought especially to meet the needs of the plain pastor and the common layman. In Tübingen and in Stuttgart it was not regarded as a confession, but as a theological system filled with scholastic subtilties. Hence the Würtemberg theologians neither approved it nor returned it to Brunswick.

Thus, notwithstanding the labor that had been bestowed upon it, the *Swabian-Saxon Concordia* failed to become a *formula of concord between the Swabian and Saxon churches,* though it had become a formula of concord between nearly all the churches of Lower Saxony. But the strenuous efforts made by Duke Julius and Chemnitz, to gain confessional recognition for it in Saxony, in Anhalt, in Prussia, and in other parts of Germany, were without effect. Heshuss, who was now Bishop of Samland, and Wigand, who was Bishop of Pomesania, had no confidence in Andreae. That is, as a matter of fact, all the efforts made hitherto to construct a formula of doctrine that should be accepted by all the churches of the Augsburg Confession, or even by any very considerable part of them, have come to naught.† Chemnitz was almost in despair when help came suddenly from a quarter from which he had previously had only the gravest apprehension, namely, from the Elector of Saxony.

5. *The Maulbronn Formula.*

In one of his journeys the Elector August of Saxony chanced to speak with Count George Ernest of Henneberg of the desirability of composing the controversies which had arisen among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. The Count told the Elector that the Wittenberg theologians were suspected by other

* See Andreae's letter in Hutter, *Witebergae,* 1614, pp. 85*b et seqq.*

† See Heppe, *ut supra,* III., 66-68; *Realencyclopädie,*[3] X., p. 740; Schütz, *Vita Chytraei,* pp. 85 *et seqq.;* Loescher, III., p. 252. The letters of Duke Julius to Duke Albert Frederick of Prussia and to Heshuss and Wigand, and Chemnitz's letter to Heshuss and Wigand, are given by Rehtmeyer, III., Beylagen, pp. 246 *et seqq.* See also Leuckfeld's *Historia Heshusiana,* pp. 112 *et seqq.* For the list of churches in Lower Saxony that had approved the *Swabian-Saxon Formula,* see Chemnitz's letter, to which reference has been made above.

Lutheran theologians of entertaining errors, and that said errors would have to be condemned before concord could be permanently established. Thereupon the Elector exhorted the Count to make a beginning, and promised to do all in his power to promote concord. A little later (November, 1575,) Count George Ernest, while attending the wedding festivities of Duke Ludwig at Stuttgart, reported to the Duke and to the Margrave of Baden, the conversation which he had had with the Elector of Saxony on the matter of composing the disputes of the theologians. Thereupon these three Princes resolved to take the matter in hand in accordance with the expressed wish of the Elector of Saxony. Immediately they commissioned Luke Osiander, Würtemberg Court Preacher, Balthaser Bidembach, Provost at Stuttgart, Abel Scherdinger, Henneberg Court Preacher, and some Baden theologians to present an *Opinion* "as to the manner in which a document might be composed, and by which a beginning might be made, for a true concord between the churches of the Augsburg Confession, and by which the errors that have crept in and the divisions might be removed, and the known sects might be excluded." *

On the very same day (November 14th) on which they had received their commission the theologians assembled at Stuttgart, present to their Princes a report in which they recommend that the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, Luther's Catechisms "and Luther's other important writings," should be the basis; that the controverted doctrine should be stated and explained according to the above-named confessions, and supported by passages from the Scriptures and from the ancient creeds; then the opposite doctrine should be stated in antithesis and refuted, yet without naming the persons who had defended the errors. As the occasion may demand, a passage or two may be quoted from the writings of Luther. But the writings of Melanchthon are not to be quoted, either for defending the true doctrine or for the refutation of an error in doctrine.†

The proposition of the theologians was approved by the Princes, who at once commissioned Luke Osiander and Balthaser Bidembach to compose a formula of pacification according to the plan exhibited. When the two theologians just named had

* Hutter, *ut supra*, Cap. XI.; Heppe, *ut supra*, III., 74, 75; Planck, IV., 429.

† Hutter, *ut supra*, Cap. XI.

completed their work they met with a few Henneberg and Baden theologians in the Maulbronn Cloister. These all together examined the proposed formula, and, January 19, 1576, approved and signed it. It is known as the Maulbronn Formula. It remained unprinted until it was discovered in 1866 by Dr. Theodore Pressel in the Archives at Dresden, and published by him in Volume XI. of the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie,* pp. 640 *et seqq.* We can now determine how much it contributed to the Torgau Book.

The Formula consists of the following articles given in the following order: 1. *Of Original Sin,* 2. *Of the Person of Christ,* 3. *Of the Righteousness of Faith,* 4. *Of the Law and Gospel,* 5. *Of Good Works,* 6. *Of the Holy Supper of our Lord,* 7. *Of Church Usages, which are called Adiaphora, or Things Indifferent,* 8. *Of Free-will,* 9. *Of the Third Use of God's Law.*

Each article is introduced by quoting the corresponding article from the Augsburg Confession, except the last, which has no article directly corresponding to it in the Confession. The whole is signed by Balthaser Bidembach, Provost at Stuttgart; Luke Osiander, Würtemberg Court Preacher; Rupert Dürr, Superintendent at Pforsheim; Abel Scherdinger, Henneberg Court Preacher; Peter Streck, Consistorial and Pastor at Sull. The treatment is by thesis and antithesis, and by massing quotations from the Scriptures, from the Ancient Symbols, and from the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles and from Luther's Catechisms, all of which are recognized as the *communis consensus.* Also numerous quotations are introduced from writings of Luther other than the Catechisms and the Schmalkald Articles. The materials are brought together in a systematic, orderly and compact manner. The style is as even and as uniform as the qualities of the materials would seem to allow. It covers seventy printed pages of about three hundred and fifty words each, and is about one half as voluminous as the *Swabian-Saxon Concordia.* In its Christology it is decidedly Swabian. It declares that "Christ even as a man knows all things, can do all things and is present everywhere in his Church, and as a man he sits at the right hand of God and rules with God in almighty power, present in all places in heaven and in earth, above all creatures." The article on the Lord's Supper is composed very largely of quotations from the Older Confessions and from Luther's Greater Confession against Zwingli, including the declaration: "I confess the Sacrament of the Altar, that there the body and the

blood in the bread and wine are truly eaten and drunk by the mouth, though the priests who administer it, or they who partake of it, do not believe, or otherwise misuse it.'' The article on Free-will is constructed in like manner, including a quotation from the Greater Confession and an appeal to the *De Servo Arbitrio* against Erasmus.

In this Formula the exposition and argument in each article are so conducted as to find their climax in Luther. Melanchthon, in accordance with the programme submitted to and accepted by the three Princes, is not once named, while Luther's private writings, not infrequently those which are most violently polemical, and which antedate the Confessions, are quoted as of final authority. This gives the Formula a one-sided and a decidedly polemical character. Hence, as a whole, it stands for Lutherism rather than for Lutheranism. Nevertheless the Formula was approved by Duke Ludwig of Würtemberg, by Margrave Carl of Baden and by Count George Ernest of Henneberg. February 9, 1576, the Count sent a copy of it to the Elector of Saxony, who had already received, from Duke Julius of Brunswick, a copy of the *Swabian-Saxon Concordia.**

* See Hutter, Cap. XI., p. 85; Heppe, III., 76; Planck, IV., 429, 430; Köllner, pp. 540 *et seqq.;* Anton, pp. 164 *et seqq.* Some authors say that August received the two writings at about the same time.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE TORGAU BOOK.

In the year 1573 Flacianism was expelled from Jena. The next year Crypto-Calvinism was driven from Wittenberg. The negotiations of the years 1573-1575 had led to a close approximation of Würtemberg and Lower Saxony in matters of faith. Three Princes of Upper Germany had united in a formula. Andreae was indefatigable, pliant and tenacious. Chemnitz was moderate and judicious. Duke Julius was strenuous and active. Landgrave William was sympathetic and alert. The Elector August had committed himself to the project of pacification. The psychological moment had come. The thought that ruled in the minds and hearts of the most influential Lutheran theologians and Princes was that of pacification. A common desire and a common sentiment were bringing multitudes from different directions to a common goal. While the Princes of Upper Germany were projecting and their theologians were preparing a formula of pacification, the Elector of Saxony was counselling with his confidential advisers and with Princes as to the best method of effecting pacification among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. November 21, 1575, he addressed a communication on the subject to Hans von Bernstein, Tham von Sebottendorf, Dr. Laurence Lindemann and Dr. David Pfeiffer. He calls attention to the fact that almost every land has its own *Corpus Doctrinae*. Unity under such circumstances cannot be effected. He suggests that "we who subscribe the Augsburg Confession unite in a friendly way and agree that each ruler shall name three or four pacific theologians and as many civil counsellors, and that the rulers shall hold a convention on this subject, and that each ruler shall bring his own *Corpus Doctrinae*, and that these theologians and counsellors together shall be charged with the duty of taking the Augsburg Confession as their norm and of conferring and counselling in regard to the *Corpus Doctrinae*, so that, by God's grace, out of all one *Corpus* may be constructed which we can all subscribe, and that this book or *Corpus Doctrinae* shall be printed and placed before every ruler as the norm for his clergy." To this end the Elector

consulted the Elector of Brandenburg, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Landgrave of Hesse and the Count of Henneberg.* The counsellors approved the Elector's proposition November 26th, and when now he learned that the Princes had also approved his plans of pacification, he resolved to call a convention of his chief theologians.

1. *The Lichtenberg Convention,* 1576.

On the 15th of February twelve theologians assembled at Lichtenberg on the Elbe, in obedience to the electoral summons. They were: Dr. Salmuth of Leipzig, Dr. Crell of Wittenberg, Dr. Harder of Leipzig, Dr. Mörlin of Coburg, Dr. Selneccer of Leipzig, Dr. Greser of Dresden, Dr. Mirus of Dresden, Masters Lystenius, Jagenteufel, Cornicaelius, Sagittarius and Glaser, respectively of Dresden, Meissen, Hayna, Annaberg and Dresden.

In his Proposition, after reminding the theologians of the strifes, divisions and quarrels which for years had raged among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, and after noting the fact that all previous efforts to effect a better understanding, had produced no good results, he declares that he and other Princes of the Augsburg Confession have resolved to make another effort "to establish Christian concord and a correct, unanimous understanding in doctrine between the theologians and Estates of the Augsburg Confession." He says that they have been led to undertake this work "because we and you know that some of the disputatious theologians, like Illyricus and others, who started this strife, have died, and others have been so used up by controversies and quarrels, that they have come to their senses, and will probably show themselves more reasonable." "There are also many God-fearing and pacific theologians now living who desire concord and from their hearts sigh and pray to God Almighty for it." He then asks for an *Opinion* on the five following questions:

1. Who and how many theologians from the Estates are to be brought together and employed?

2. Whether the proceedings should be conducted in writing or orally.

3. Whether written statements should be made as a proper preparation.

* Walch, *Introductio,* p. 715.

4. Whether, besides the theologians, other persons should be appointed.

5. Which Articles shall be considered and settled?

The Elector's Proposition was thoroughly discussed *pro et contra*. Each one of the twelve members of the Convention delivered his opinion. Drs. Salmuth, Crell and Harder insisted that the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* be made the basis of concord. Dr. Mörlin declared that the *Corpus* was really the beginning of the schism, and to reaffirm it would give especial offense to the Prussians. Dr. Greser thought that, first of all, the obstacles should be removed, namely, the Crypto-Calvinistic documents. Then a new *Corpus Doctrinae* should be composed.

Now it was that Dr. Selneccer arose. During the last few years he had undergone a decided change in his theological views. He was also in high favor with the Elector. He declared that the times had changed, that a break must be made with much that belonged to the past, that they must plant themselves on the word of Luther. He complained of the weaknesses and aberrations of Melanchthon, and declared that all that is and is called Calvinism must be excluded.

Two things are necessary for the restoration of concord: 1. All obstacles are to be removed. Not everything is to be unqualifiedly branded as *Flacianistic*, as is now the custom in the universities, but it must be shown what is meant by that word. Nor must anyone be stigmatized as an ubiquitist. As for himself, he regarded all as Calvinists who in general cry out against the ubiquitists. The *Corpus Doctrinae* dare not be put upon a candle-stick as an unchangeable symbol or norm. The books published under Crypto-Calvinistic auspices must be forbidden. The new disputes and phrases at that time in use in the universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig must be dropped, since they only give greater offense. "For at these universities it is now taught that Christ is exalted according to both natures." 2. The Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Catechisms of Luther and the Schmalkald Articles must be made the norm for doctrine. The Swabian-Saxon Articles might be examined. If they should be found to be correct, they also can be sanctioned as a norm for doctrine. The questions touching the doctrine of Free-will, the definition of the Gospel, the necessity of good works to salvation, the *communicatio idiomatum*, and others of recent appearance, can be treated in a colloquy, to which such foreign theologians as Chytraeus, Andreae, Chemnitz, Marbach

and others may be invited. Only in this way can anyone hope for the restoration of concord. The civil authorities would then stand by these fundamental principles of concord, and they must remove all those who, in the universities or elsewhere, should act contrariwise.

When all had had their say, it was found that a decided majority stood with Selneccer. He was, therefore, requested to draw up the report which was to be delivered to the Elector. The next morning, at 9 o'clock, he read his draft before the Convention. In the afternoon he copied it with his own hand, whereupon it was signed by all the members of the Convention and delivered to the Elector.

The chief points of this Lichtenberg *Opinion* are as follows:

First of all, should the theologians of all parties wholly forgive and forget all the differences and controversies of the past. The former causes of disunion must be abolished. The *Corpus Doctrinae* has given offense because it is not sufficiently explicit on the doctrine of Free-will, the definition of the Gospel, and the Lord's Supper as against the Sacramentarians. "The book called *Corpus Doctrinae* we will bind on no man's conscience, nor press it upon anyone as a symbol or norm, but we hold it to be a glorious, good, useful book, and we commend it as a method of teaching and learning, by means of which teachers and youth may exercise themselves in speaking, in writing and in teaching." "But as the norm of our doctrine and Confession we present and name, first of all, and without qualification, the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures, the three Ecumenical Creeds confessed in the entire Christian Church, the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian, and then the first unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the same, Luther's Smaller and Larger Catechisms and the Schmalkald Articles. Also, if on account of the doctrine of the righteousness of man before God anyone wishes to add the glorious and comforting explanation of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, published by Dr. Luther, we are perfectly agreed." The Crypto-Calvinistic writings are to be abolished. A convention of pacific and unsuspected theologians should be called for the purpose of discussing in order the Articles of the Augsburg Confession. To this convention should be invited, in accordance with the wish of Landgrave William of Hesse, Chytraeus, Chemnitz, Andreae and Marbach.

Some other matters, though of small importance, were made the subject of action the next day. On the following day, Febru-

ary 18th, the theologians left Lichtenberg. A most important step had been taken in the direction of concord. The Elector was delighted with the *Opinion* of his theologians and returned them his thanks through some of his counsellors.*

2. *The Torgau Convention.*

The Elector of Saxony, following the *Opinion* of his theologians and the recommendation of Landgrave William, called Jacob Andreae to Saxony to assist in the work of concord. On the 9th of April he arrived at Torgau. His first concern was to have the Elector call a convention as soon as possible to act on the suggestions of the Lichtenberg Convention, and to construct a formula of concord out of the two formulae already placed in his hands. To this end a convention was arranged for May 28th. Chemnitz of Brunswick, Chytraeus of Rostock, Andrew Musculus and Christopher Koerner of Frankfort-on-the-Oder were invited to attend. In addition to these, the Elector summoned all the theologians who had attended the Lichtenberg Convention, except Dr. Salmuth, whose place was filled by Caspar Heyderich, Pastor and Superintendent at Torgau.† The convention was opened May 28th in the Castle Hartenfels at Torgau. The Electoral Secretary, John Jenitzsch, read the Electoral Proposition, by which the theologians are exhorted to confer together in the fear of God, to examine the various propositions handed in, and to compose, in writing, not only a formula of concord, but a discussion of the Articles of the Augsburg Confession which had been subjects of controversy, so that there may be a unanimous agreement about religion, and that confidence may be restored and maintained.‡

In accordance with the requirements of the Electoral Proposition the theologians advanced to their work. They first took up the Swabian-Saxon Concordia and the Maulbronn Formula for comparison. At once the question arose, Which of the two shall have the precedence? Chemnitz and Chytraeus contended that the Swabian-Saxon Concordia should have the first place. Andreae favored the Maulbronn Formula. Andreae at length accomplished by diplomacy what he could not accomplish by

* For the official documents connected with the Lichtenberg Convention, see Hutter, Cap. IX., pp. 75 *et seqq.* For historical details, see Anton, pp. 156 *et seqq.;* Planck, VI., 437 *et seqq.;* Walch, *Introductio,* pp. 715 *et seqq.;* Heppe, III., 84 *et seqq.;* Pressel in *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie,* 1877, pp. 10 *et seqq.;* Müller's *Die Symbolische Bücher, Einleitung,* IX. edition, p. lxxi.

† Hutter, Cap. XI., p. 91; Planck, VI., pp. 448-9; Heppe, III., p. 102.

‡ Hutter, Cap. XI., 89 *et seqq.;* Planck, VI., 449, 450; Heppe, III., 103.

argument. He conceded that the Swabian-Saxon Concordia should be taken as the basis, provided that everything which was peculiar to the Maulbronn Formula, especially its numerous citations from the private writings of Luther, should be introduced into the proposed new formula. This was a nice piece of diplomacy, by which Andreae brought Chemnitz and Chytraeus to the full approval of his demands, and to the execution of the programme exhibited in the Maulbronn Formula. It contributed to the omission of the name of Melanchthon from the Torgau Book. It installed numerous passages taken from Luther's polemical writings as confessional. It gave the Torgau Book, and finally the *Formula Concordiae,* a decidedly Swabian complexion.*

Much difficulty was experienced in treating the Articles on Original Sin and Free-will. Some of the theologians defended the views of Melanchthon on Free-will, and others opposed them. It was during the discussion of this subject, the historians think, that the choleric Musculus sprang up and declared that he would leave the convention.† However, he was prevailed upon to remain in the convention. But the Article on Free-will was constructed so as to differ significantly from the Article under the same title which had been written by Chytraeus for the Swabian-Saxon Formula. Some passages were removed from Chytraeus' article, and quotations were introduced from the Augsburg Confession, from the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles and the Catechisms of Luther.‡

Early in the convention, Andreae reported to the Elector that the theologians had agreed on two Articles of great importance, namely, that of Original Sin and that of Free-will.§ The work now went rapidly forward. The remaining obstacles to agreement were easily overcome. On the seventh of June the theologians brought their work to a close, and sent a communication to the Elector, in which they inform him that they have followed his Proposition, and have prepared, in writing, a *Corpus* on the basis of the Maulbronn and Swabian-Saxon formulae, both of which they regard as in accord with God's Word. They express the hope that those who teach purely in the churches will take no great offense at their work, and that peace and harmony may be

* Kolde, *Einleitung,* p. lxxii.

† Schütz, *Vita Chytraei,* II., 405; Anton, p. 171; Gieseler, IV., 483, note 8; Planck, VI., p. 454, note 198.

‡ Balthasar, I., 11; Anton, p. 171.

§ Hutter, Cap. IX., p. 91.

restored. They declare that they have no desire to deprive anyone of his independent judgment and that they wish to submit their conclusions to the judgment of the Princes and of their theologians.

Thus arose the *Torgau Book* (so called from the place of its composition), which is the formal precursor of the *Bergic Book*, which is generally known as the *Formula of Concord*. This Torgau Book contains the following articles, placed in the following order: 1. Of Original Sin; 2. Of Free-will; 3. Of the Righteousness of Faith before God; 4. Of Good Works; 5. Of the Law and the Gospel; 6. Of the Third Use of the Law of God; 7. Of the Holy Supper; 8. Of the Person of Christ; 9. Of the Descensus of Christ; 10. Of Church Usages; 11. Of God's Eternal Predestination and Election; 12. Of Other Parties and Sects which never subscribed to the Augsburg Confession—which is also the order of the Articles under the same titles in the Formula of Concord.

At the end of the Articles, Andreae, Selneccer, Musculus, Koerner, Chytraeus and Chemnitz place and subscribe the following declaration: "These and the like articles together, and whatever is connected with them, or follows from them, we reject and condemn as incorrect, false, heretical and contrary to God's Word, to the three Symbols, to the Augsburg Confession and Apology, to the Schmalkald Articles and Luther's Catechisms; against these all pious Christians will and should guard themselves as they value the salvation and happiness of their souls.

"On the contrary, before the face of God and before the whole Christian Church, in the presence of those now living and of those who shall come after us, we wish to testify that this explanation of the controverted articles now made, and no other, is our faith, doctrine and confession, in which, by God's grace, with fearless heart, we are willing to appear before the judgment seat of Christ and render an account for this transaction. To Him be thanks, honor and glory, world without end. Amen." *

But not only did these six theologians thus testify their approval of the doctrine contained in the Torgau Book; they united with other members of the Convention in a service of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the unexpected but auspicious issue of the Convention. Selneccer preached. Andreae exulted

* Semler, *Abdruck des Torgischen Buchs*, p. 322.

over this consummation of the seven years of his activity in the work of concord. Chytraeus wrote to his friends that the right hand of the Most High was to be recognized in the transactions of the Torgau Convention.* Chemnitz returned home, and on June 14th he wrote Duke Julius that he now had hope of a complete concord among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession.† In the Duchy of Mecklenburg and in the cities of Lower Saxony public thanksgiving was rendered to God for the happy termination of the Torgau Convention.‡

3. *The Torgau Book Subjected to Examination.*

It will be remembered that the theologians assembled at Torgau recommended that their work be submitted to the Princes and their theologians for further consideration. Acting on this recommendation, the Elector of Saxony not only examined the book himself and required an opinion from his counsellors, but he sent it to most of the Lutheran Princes, as to the Elector of Brandenburg, the Landgrave of Hesse, the dukes of Brunswick, Pomerania, Mecklenburg and Holstein, to the Palsgraves of Neuburg and Zweibrücken, and requested them to have it examined by their theologians, and to report to him their opinions.§ Chemnitz was appointed to bring the matter before the cities of Lower Saxony, especially before Brunswick, Lübeck, Hamburg and Lüneburg.|| He also sought to gain the approbation of the Prussian churches. To that end he wrote a long letter to Heshuss, who was now Bishop of Samland. As this letter throws much light on the whole situation at this time, we present it entire in English dress:

"Greeting in Christ, who is our true and only salvation. Most Reverend Lord Bishop. Since your messenger urged me, I was not willing that he should return to you without a letter from me, especially since at this time a change of the right hand of the Most High has furnished a good reason why I should write. Your Most Reverend Lordship remembers that three years ago the Swabian churches began to desire union with the churches of Lower Saxony, and that shortly thereafter they sent hither a draft of a formula of agreement. Inasmuch as not all the controversies of the present time were thought to be satisfactorily explained in the said draft, a fuller declaration was added by

* Schütz, *Vita*, II., 406.
† Rehtmeyer, III., 449.
‡ Schütz, *Vita*, p. 406.
§ Köllner, pp. 547 *et seqq.*; Planck, VI., 457.
|| Loescher, III., 255. Rehtmeyer, III., 451.

us in accordance with your Prussian Corpus. And since all the neighboring churches were permitted to indicate what they thought ought to be corrected, changed or added, it was revised four times. The matter made very tedious and slow progress in this land; for not a few civil counsellors and theologians, though they did not object to the undertaking, and did not desiderate anything in the contents, nevertheless clearly indicated that they were afraid that the Elector of Saxony would be offended and irritated by such procedure. (For we are indeed steadfast confessors.) However, at length that document was reduced to form and sent to Tübingen in October of last year. But when many there feared the same thing (of which I have just now spoken), the document was suppressed, and was not laid before the Swabian churches. Finally it was sent to you also to be declared as formula of agreement and union among the churches. I would have despaired, had I not thought that it would be the symbol of the churches in this part of Saxony, although I did not dare be certain about it. But behold the change of the right hand of the Most High; for when the Elector of Saxony had discovered the deception of his theologians in the Article of the Supper, he began to have doubts in regard to their entire contention, and also when he had learned that negotiations were pending about a formula of agreement between the churches of Saxony and Swabia. Therefore, after consulting certain Princes, and his own trustworthy counsellors, he called a convention, February 15th, and inquired for a method of establishing a godly general concord in the churches of the Augsburg Confession, and of removing the obstacles to such a concord. February 18th [16th] the theologians reply that the chief obstacle to concord is that the *Corpus Doctrinae Misnicum* has been set forth as a norm of doctrine. Therefore they recommend that he should order that for the future that *Corpus* should not be regarded as a norm and form of doctrine and confession, nor imposed upon anyone, since it contained certain errors, as in regard to Free-will, the Gospel, the Supper, etc. They also advised the Elector to ask that the Formula of Concord be sent to him from the Saxon and Swabian churches. It was also decided at Lichtenberg that personalities should be buried. The Elector then wrote to Duke Julius that that formula be sent to him, which at first I thought was not done with good intent. He had also written in regard to the same matter to the Duke of Würtemberg. At that very time (as I afterwards learned) cer-

tain Würtemberg, Baden and Henneberg theologians had gathered at Maulbronn, and, thinking that the Saxon Formula was too prolix, made a compend by omitting certain controversies and by adding many excellent passages from Luther. This compend was also sent to the Elector. Then it came about that, May 27th, the Elector summoned to Torgau, besides his own, certain foreign theologians, as Musculus, Cörner, Jacob Andreae, Chytraeus and myself. I was miserable, and was compelled to go thither entirely against my will, having no hope of anything. The reasons you can imagine.

"But, contrary to expectation, I found a perfectly pious and proper zeal in the mind of the Elector. The request was made that we examine both the Saxon and the Maulbronn Formulae, and that we report to the Elector our opinion in regard to the controverted articles. The articles of both formulae were examined in order, and opinions were expressed in regard to each. And, although there were those who thought that the Maulbronn Formula should be preferred on account of its brevity, nevertheless, the majority decided that the Saxon should be retained, but in such a way that the passages from Luther and all else that might be regarded as useful should be taken from the Maulbronn Formula. Thus the Maulbronn Preface, inasmuch as it was more vigorous and better suited to the present purpose, was adopted. In other places certain passages from Luther were added. Also certain of Luther's declarations in regard to the law and the Gospel were added, and certain other things were added. In the Article on Justification we refer to Luther's *Commentary on Galatians*. In the Article on Free-will we refer expressly to Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* and to his *Declaration* on Genesis 26. Mention of Philip's books is expunged, and for justification at this point we refer to the Lichtenberg resolution. Thus a formula, prepared without any opposition on the part of the Electoral theologians, by the consent of all, was laid before the Elector, June 7th. A statement was also made and subscribed by all, in which it is distinctly said that what we present is only an opinion, which is not to be prejudicial to any Estate or church of the Augsburg Confession, but that we submit our work to the judgment of the churches of the Augsburg Confession (the Calvinists excepted), and yet we hope that they who love truth and peace will not find much lacking. But primarily we meant by thesis and antithesis to construct something certain in those matters. But action or deliberation in regard to personal mat-

ters we postpone to a future general council. However, in our *Opinion* we mention certain things that have reference to personal matters, namely, those obstacles to concord which must be rejected, as the *Grundfeste, Neue Catechismus, Disputatio Grammatica, Fragstück, Dressdische Declaration, Acta Synodica,* and in general, other writings and books which are contrary to this our *Opinion.* For such are the words of the formula. But the Elector promised to send the *Opinion* to the other orders of the Augsburg Confession, so that each one might present his opinion. Afterwards a general convention will be held, in which something certain will be determined. It will be sent to you also, for this I have particularly requested, for I have said that all you seek is to have the truth conserved by rejecting the corruptions. But when those things for which we had been called together had been disposed of, we wrote in common a supplication to the Elector in behalf of the exiled Thuringians. All the Electoral theologians signed it except Mörlin and Mirus. And, as I hope, Master Gerhard has already been conceded to the widowed Princess of Saxony. And all these things in this entire transaction occurred aside from, beyond, above, contrary to the hope, expectation and thought of all. I was utterly astounded, and could scarcely believe that these things were done when they were done. It seemed like a dream to me. Certainly a good, happy and desired beginning has been made toward the restoration of purity of doctrine, toward the elimination of corruptions, toward the establishment of a godly confession. But if any can suggest something that is useful, or if there be anyone who can do it better, the Church will owe him a debt of gratitude.

"These things I have desired on this occasion to make known to Your Most Reverend Lordship, so that, as rumors are already getting abroad, you might know the truth. And that you may promote this difficult and salutary work by your prayers, your counsels and your exertions, I do not think that there is any need that I should exhort you. That it has been your purpose that corruptions should be rejected, and that the purity of the Lutheran doctrine should be retained, I have no doubt. Since to this end we have made a moderate beginning and have followed the *Prussian Corpus Doctrinae,* I do not doubt your willingness to promote this matter. I have understood that there are some pseudo-Lutherans, who indulge the hope that this entire undertaking will be disturbed and obstructed by you. But I

said at Torgau, and I still say, what I thought and hoped of you.

"The Elector is reported to have said that since you have shown that you seek only the rejection of corruptions and the conservation of the purity of the Lutheran doctrine, and since this is done, he hopes you will give your approval in this matter. But when the Formula shall have been sent to you by the Elector, you will read it and judge. The Elector is thinking about reorganizing the University of Wittenberg, so that it may be soundly Lutheran. He has already negotiated with Chytraeus. He negotiated with me also, but I declined on account of age and for many other reasons. Dr. Jacob has conducted himself in this transaction altogether properly and well. Selneccer has also conducted himself very well and has contributed not a little to advance matters. Among the Electoral theologians there are other very good men. But I cannot go into particulars. Did not long distance stand in the way, I should like to speak with you face to face. Nor would that be without profit. May God confirm and promote the work which he has begun for the glory of his name and for the edification of the Church. You can communicate these things to your colleague, the Lord Bishop Wigand. Salute my old friend, Doctor Valerius. But especially the Lord Chancellor. Etc. Farewell. June 23, Anno 1576." *

Andreae was appointed to solicit the coöperation of Holstein and Hesse.† He, too, wrote a letter (July 24, 1576) to his old enemies and calumniators, Heshuss and Wigand. He says: "Let not the evils of former years come to recollection, but rejoice over the marvelous things that God is now doing. For the following I dare solemnly to affirm to you and to promise, namely: The Most Illustrious Elector of Saxony is fully determined that *the doctrine of Luther,* which has in part been obscured, in part corrupted, in part openly and secretly condemned, shall be restored pure and unadulterated in the schools and churches, and therefore Luther, *that is, Christ,* whose faithful servant Luther was, lives. What more do you wish? Nothing is counterfeited, nothing extenuated, nothing concealed, but it is in accordance with *the spirit of Luther, which is* the Spirit of Christ. Candidly, openly, piously, sacredly are all things done for illustrating and promoting the truth. *The brightness of this divine goodness so contracts my eyes* that, should I desire

* Rehtmeyer, III., *Beylage* VIII., 255 *et seqq.;* also in Leuckfeld's *Historia Heshusiana,* pp. 121 *et seqq.*

† Loescher, III., p. 255.

never so much, it would be impossible for me to be disturbed by remembering or by seeing those misfortunes that came upon me in former years. The feeling and judgment of Doctors Chemnitz and Chytraeus, who were at Torgau, are the same. *Often were they almost overwhelmed with rejoicing and wonder that we were there brought to such deliberations.* Truly, this is the change of the right hand of the Most High, which ought also to remind us that since the truth no longer suffers, we should do all things which can contribute to the restoration of good feeling. We ought to forget injuries. That which was done by the Most Illustrious Elector with a sacred and heroic heart, we ought also to do. We are men, and should remember that we are men. Nor is anything withheld by us which is due to the truth and to the Church. When I shall have seen that accomplished in our churches, of which I have hope, and shall not doubt, I am ready to depart from this life with the greater rejoicing, since I shall have seen a conscientious and sacred concord restored to our churches.'' *

It cannot be denied that these two letters throw a good deal of light on the methods employed to conciliate the Flacianists and to win their endorsement of the Torgau Book. Chemnitz takes pains to inform Heshuss that there is absolutely no recognition of Melanchthon, that the article on Free-will is referred expressly to Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio,* and to the declaration made in Genesis 26th; that intercession had been made for the Thuringian exiles, and that the University of Wittenberg was to be made genuinely Lutheran. Andreae glorifies Luther after the manner of the Flacianists, declares that Luther's spirit is the spirit of Christ, and identifies Luther with Christ. Surely one should think that Heshuss and Wigand would find that everything for which they had so long contended had now been conceded, and that Chemnitz and Andreae and the Elector of Saxony were ready to fall down before the two Bishops of Prussia.

On the tenth of September Heshuss makes reply to the letter of Chemnitz after he has read the Torgau Book. But he is not wholly satisfied with the Book, nor does he express full confidence in Andreae and Selneccer. He says that if Andreae, Selneccer and Crell have sincerely repented, they are to be held as

* Original in Heppe, III., 111. The Latin style in this letter, and also in that by Chemnitz, is far from being classic. It may be that the text has not been well reproduced.

most dear brethren. In general he is pleased with the Torgau Book, but he desiderates some things, and thinks "that necessity demands that in this formula the authors and patrons of corruptions, as Illyricus, Pfeffinger, Osiander, Major, Calvin, Peter Martyr, the letter of Philipp to the Elector of the Palatinate,* should be named and should be pointed out to the Church and to posterity, so that in the reading of books the young may be able to avoid the errors which conflict with the Formula of Concord," that is, with the Torgau Book. He humbly entreats that care be taken to keep the young from reading the books of Melanchthon. He also begs that a decree be published and promulgated, announcing the abolition of the *Corpus Doctrinae Misnicum* as a norm of doctrine. Taken as a whole and in its generic aspects, this letter shows the intense hostility of the Flacianists to all that is Melanchthonian.†

* After Heshuss and Klebitz had been dismissed from Heidelberg for fighting over the communion cup, the Elector of the Palatinate, Frederick III., sent to Melanchthon for his judgment on the situation. The latter approved the action of the Elector, and suggested agreement on one form of words. "And in this controversy it would be desirable to retain the words of Paul: 'The bread which we break is the communion of the body.'" He objected to the proposition of Heshuss: "The bread is the true body of Christ." C. R. IX., 962.

† The letter is given by Hospinian, *Concordia Discors*, pp. 72-73; also by Leuckfeld, *Historia Heshusiana*, pp. 130 et seqq. Heshuss was at the time of writing to Chemnitz a thorough-going ubiquitarian. He declared that it is right to say, both in the abstract and in the concrete: "The human nature of Christ is omnipotent, omniscient, and is to be adored." Hartknoch, *Preussische Kirchen-Historia*, pp. 463-4.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE AUTHORS OF THE TORGAU BOOK.

While seeming to wait for the opinions on the Torgau Book it will not be amiss to acquaint ourselves more closely with the six men, who, more than all others, are responsible for the Torgau Book, who signed it as their "faith, doctrine and confession," and afterwards changed it into the Bergic Book or Formula of Concord. Sometimes these six are spoken of as the first and second triumvirates, the first being composed of Jacob Andreae, Martin Chemnitz and Nicholas Selneccer, the second embracing David Chytraeus, Andrew Musculus and Christopher Koerner.

1. *Jacob Andreae.*

Jacob Andreae was born at Waiblingen in Würtemberg, March 25, 1528. Because his father was a smith he was often called Schmiedlein, Schmiedjacob. He studied at Stuttgart and Tübingen. In 1545 he acquired the degree of Master of Philosophy, and was appointed Diaconus in Stuttgart. Because he would not accept the *Interim* in 1548 he lost his position. In 1553 he was made Superintendent in Göppingen, and during the same year he received the degree of Doctor of Theology. In the years immediately following he was employed by several Princes to assist in introducing the Lutheran doctrine into their dominions. In 1557 he attended the Diet of Regensburg as court preacher to Duke Christopher of Würtemberg. In 1562 he was made Chancellor and Provost at Tübingen. The same year he was sent, in company with Christopher Binder, to Thuringia to assist in settling the strife that had arisen between Victorine Strigel and Flacius Illyricus on Free-will. Here he approved and signed Strigel's *Declaration* (see p. 362). In the next year he assisted in composing a controversy in Strassburg that had arisen between Dr. John Marbach and Jerome Zanchi on "the inamissibility of grace." In the year 1568 he was invited to Brunswick by Duke Julius to coöperate with Chemnitz in introducing the Reformation into the Duke's dominions. Here he took part in composing the Church Order, and formed the acquaintance of Chemnitz and other theologians of Lower

Saxony; and here it was that he formally made known his plan of a consensus of doctrine between the Saxon and other Lutheran churches.

In the work of concord he spent by far the greater part of the next ten years. Of his negotiations with the Wittenbergers in 1569, and of his activity in the Zerbst Convention in 1570, we have already spoken. But such was his activity in the work of concord that he is said to have visited nearly all the evangelical courts, cities and universities in Northern and Southern Germany, and to have made no less than one hundred and twenty-six journeys. While the theologians of Lower Saxony were elaborating the Swabian Concordia into the Swabian-Saxon Concordia, Andreae was activily engaged in settling theological controversies in upper Germany, in introducing the Reformation into different lands, in writing, in preaching and in discharging the duties of his academic offices.

As we have already learned Andreae entered the service of the Elector August, April 9, 1576. For the next five years nearly he was engaged in promoting the work of concord, and in directing the affairs of the churches and universities in Saxony. In December, 1580, he was dismissed from the service of August with a show of honor, but actually as a *persona non grata.* His character is hard to analyze. In common with almost every theologian of his time, he was the victim of calumny and detraction. But not all the evil that was said about him was false. Chemnitz and Chytraeus accuse him of being papistically tyrannical. At Dresden he calumniated Chemnitz "high and low," to the Elector.* Chytraeus, after the second revision of the Bergic Book, could never hear the name of Andreae nor speak it, without some exhibition of bitter feeling toward him.† Paul von Eytzen in a letter charges him with "malevolence and with lying misrepresentation," ‡ and Joachim Mörlin charges him "with insincerity, and as being a person who tries to unite truth with falsehood, light with darkness, Christ with Belial." §

Selneccer makes an arraignment of him in a writing signed by his own hand, January 29, 1579, that is almost without a parallel in the entire history of accusation. Here with date

* Rehtmeyer, III., 477. See the Elector's gracious letter to Chemnitz. Rehtmeyer, III., Beylagen, No. 83.

† Planck, VI., 546-7. See Arnold's *Unparteyische Kirchenhistorie,* I; Tom., 813-14.

‡ *Dänische Bibliothec,* IV , 274.

§ *Dänische Bibliothec,* V., 387.

and place named he gives, or affects to give, what he heard Andreae say and saw him do "from 1576 to the day at Jüterbogk (19 January, 1579)." The exhibition is entirely unedifying.* If one half of the accusations are only half-way true, then Jacob Andreae was a most unamiable and untrustworthy character. If they be generally false then was Selneccer the prince of slanderers. His monument must abide in shame and in calumniation. Making due allowance for jealousy and envy on the part of Selneccer we must conclude that there is good reason for much that is charged, and that Jacob Andreae was proud, vain, domineering, disingenuous and self-contradictory.

There can be no doubt that he was indefatigable in the pursuit of ends, but not scrupulous in the choice of means. He was dictatorial toward his equals, but diplomatic toward his superiors. He could be pugnacious and yet conciliatory. He combined in one person many opposite qualities of character. He was dogmatic, obstinate, passionate. He is described, when speaking, as *vehemens, extollens vocem sicut tubam, mera tonitrua sonabat.*

In Christology Andreae was a disciple of Brentz. Hence in the doctrine of the person of Christ he was a ubiquitarian. In 1562 he approved and signed Strigel's *Declaration* on Free-will "as in harmony with the Word of God, with the Augsburg Confession, the Apology," etc. To Doctor Paul Crell he wrote: "I will hold abiding union with you in doctrine, and would rather that the earth should swallow me up than that I should depart one nail's breadth from your *Corpus Doctrinae.*"† At Wittenberg he greatly lauded Melanchthon's *Loci*, saying: "Commended by Luther himself"; "which Doctor Luther saw, approved, commended." ‡

* Selneccer's arraignment covers ten large pages in print. It is in German, all except this paragraph: Raro orat. Rarissime communicat. Non abolum dat pauperibus. Raro vera loquitur. Male de plerisque loquitur. Dissidia serit inter fratres. Vindictae cupididissimus, Coeterorum contemptor, Solus vult esse omnia. Contristat spiritum sanctum in piis multis. Ut est lupus piscis inter pisces, ita est ipse inter sui ordinis homines; non audit bene monentes nisi cogatur superiorum autoritate; Quod jam affirmat mox negat; Jurat temere et provocat ad tribunal Dei falso; Decipit omnes qui eum non normet; est *πολυπράγμων, ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, ἐπιχαιρέκακος.* De nullo Principe bene loquitur nisi de suo; Est levis et loquax, invidus, insidiosus, Gnate Dei, converte hominem vel iure coërce. Pressel says that "through this writing we get a sad insight into the sad conditions at court, where all are hostile to all, and where a system of espionage and denunciation poisons all relations." Pressel in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1877, pp. 239-249.

† Strobel, *Literar-Geschichte Philipp Melanchthon's Loci Communes*, p. 225.

‡ Strobel, *ut supra*, p. 225.

Among the articles read by Andreae before the Leipzig and Wittenberg theologians, and deposited in the chancery of Electoral Saxony, is one *On Free-will,* which is declared to be "Christian" and "according to God's Word and the teaching of our Christian Augsburg Confession." In this article Andreae says: "Because God does not believe on man and for man, but man who becomes converted believes on God, therefore in conversion there must be not only the will of God, but also the will of man, and there can be no conversion of man unless man also wills, so that in conversion the will of God and the will of man come together. Hence the will of man is by no means like a block or a piece of wood, but it is a power of the living soul which in conversion not only suffers what God does with it, but also at the same time wills what is the will of God." He says that when God begins the work of grace in man, "there can be no conversion until the man also wills and assents to the offered grace, which willing is a work of God the Holy Spirit. Hence it is clear and manifest, that in conversion God not only offers his grace to the poor sinner, but also must reach his hand to man in order that he may lay hold of the hand of God, for the promise can be accepted and grasped only by faith." *

This is exactly in accord with the teaching of Melanchthon, that when grace precedes and the Holy Spirit incites, the will of man must act. Also in the third of his *Six Sermons* (1573), which form the real beginning of the work of concord, Andreae declares that "man is not a clod or a stone."

In the doctrine of the person of Christ, as set forth in these articles, deposited in the Saxon Chancery, we detect only a very moderate ubiquitarianism, while the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is identical in essence, and very nearly identical in words, with that of the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. He says: "We believe, teach and confess, in accord with God's Word and the teaching of the Christian Augsburg Confession, that in the Holy Supper of Christ, where it is held according to his command, with the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are administered." He says further that not only worthy and pious Christians, but also the unworthy and the hypocrites receive the true body of Christ, but to their condemnation. And this he declares to be the doctrine of all the churches which he had visited, including those of Electoral Saxony and Swabia, and of the Universities of Leipzig, Witten-

* *Unschuldige Nachrichten,* Anno 1718, pp. 208 *et seqq.*

berg, Rostock, Tübingen and Strassburg. In a word, he names almost all the principalities and cities of Germany, which, he says, hold the doctrines contained in these Articles, though they have not one syllable in regard to oral manducation. He also tells us that in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in particular, and in regard to other doctrines, he had vindicated the Wittenberg theologians against certain suspicions cast upon them by the churches in Lower Saxony.*

Thus it is made demonstrable by his own written declarations that Jacob Andreae, at the beginning of his pacification activity, proclaimed himself in complete accord with the Melanchthon type of doctrine, the matter of ubiquity alone excepted, and so he has been interpreted by the most learned and impartial historians.† There can be but one opinion in regard to the fact. Whether he was sincere in his articles, frank in his negotiations, veracious in his representations, or chiefly politic and diplomatic, we leave the reader to determine for himself. The prime duty of the historian is to give the facts.

2. *Martin Chemnitz.*

Martin Chemnitz, the youngest of his mother's three children, was born, November 9, 1522, St. Martin's Day, in Treuenbrietzen in Mark Brandenburg. He received the rudiments of education in his native town under Lawrence Barthold, who subsequently became preacher at the Brandenburg court. He it was who discovered "a special talent" in the young Chemnitz, and insisted that he should be kept in school. In his fourteenth year he was sent to Wittenberg, where for half a year he attended the Trivial School, "but without benefit, except that he had the pleasure of seeing distinguished people and of hearing Luther preach." He then returned home and for half a year enjoyed private instruction from his former teacher. In 1538 he undertook to learn the trade of clothmaker. "But I had no pleasure in it, and did nothing well," he says of himself. From Michaelmas, 1539, to St. John's Day, 1542, he attended the gymnasium at Magdeburg as a free boarder. He then spent nearly a year as assistant teacher at Calbe on the Saale. At Easter, in 1543, he entered the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and remained one year. Then he taught at Writzen, near Frankfort,

* *Unschuldige Nachrichten,* Anno 1718, pp. 213-227.

† Loescher, III., p. 243; Gieseler, IV., 465, 486, note 24; Calinich, pp. 20 and 34; *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theologie,* 1853, p. 352.

for a year and a half. In 1545 he went to Wittenberg. Here he devoted the most of his time to the study of mathematics and astrology, and in making predictions, for which he was paid by certain Princes. He also heard Luther lecture, and preach, and dispute. When the University of Wittenberg was closed on account of the Schmalkald War, he went to Prussia, arriving at Königsberg, May 18, 1547. In 1548, September 27th, he was made a Magister at Königsberg. April 5, 1550, he was appointed librarian to the Duke. In this position he had access to an abundance of theological books. He also heard lectures in the University of Königsberg on medicine and law. In April, 1553, he returned to Wittenberg, where he attentively heard Melanchthon. January 15, 1554, he was received into the Faculty of the University of Wittenberg and made examiner of candidates for the Master's Degree. At the earnest request of Melanchthon he began to lecture on the *Loci Communes,* June 9th, but finished only the *Locus* on the Trinity when he was called to Brunswick as assistant pastor. April 22, 1555, he began again his lectures on Melanchthon's *Loci.* These lectures, edited by Polycarp Leyser, were published at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1591. In the year 1555 he was married in Brunswick to Anna, a daughter of Hermann Jeger, and became the father of ten children, three boys and seven girls.*

In the year 1560, Chemnitz published his work on the Lord's Supper. In the years 1565-1573, he published in four parts his great work entitled: *An Examination of the Council of Trent.* In 1570 he published the treatise *On The Two Natures of Christ.* Improved edition in 1578. September 24, 1567, he was chosen Superintendent at Brunswick and was inducted into office on the fifteenth day of the following month. His activity in the work of concord has been in part recited. More will be told in the next chapter.

Of the uprightness of Chemnitz as a man, and of his piety as a Christian, too much cannot be said. His vision was broad, his judgment was clear, his sympathy was generous. As a theologian he was learned in the Scriptures and in the writings of the Fathers from Justin Martyr to John of Damascus. His acquaintance with the Scholastic Theology was comprehensive and accurate. He was not a theological genius; he was not en-

* All the facts recited thus far in this sketch are taken from Chemnitz's *Mea Historia,* except that about the publication of his *Loci.* See Rehtmeyer, III., 279 *et seqq.* Also, *Verein für Reformationsgeschichte,* No. 45, p. 78.

dowed with a talent for discovering new truths; but he was a great expounder of theological dogmas. He had the gift of setting theological propositions in a clear light and of illustrating them by appropriate examples. He was warmly attached to the Lutheran system of doctrines, but he was not a blind adherent either of Luther or of Melanchthon, and hence he did not bind himself to the words of either master, though in the doctrine of Free-will he was decidedly Melanchthonian. In the most forcible way he declares that man is not converted as Balaam's ass speaks, as a stone is rolled, but by meditating on the law and the Gospel, by desire, volition and assent, by struggling against security, unbelief and the stubbornness of the old man. He says expressly: "In a word, in conversion there must occur and exist some movements and actions by which some application of the mind is made by understanding; of the will, by assenting, desiring, willing, etc., and an application of the heart by serious affections to those things that have been made known to us in the law and in the Gospel. For where there is absolutely no change in the mind, in the will and in the heart, there no new knowledge, no reflection, no assent, no desire, no striving, no wrestling, etc., follows, but the entire man only resists and presents a contrary action. In a word, where there is no act of knowledge, of reflection, of desire, and of the affections, and where there is begun no application of the mind, the will, the heart, to those things that are set forth in the law and in the Gospel, there, it is certain, no conversion takes place or exists. A workman uses an inanimate tool in one way. The Holy Spirit works conversion in mind, will and heart. For he causes us to will and to be able to understand, to reflect, to desire, to assent, to accept, to work, etc."* He declares that Augustine "joins grace and Free-will"; that faith, hope, love, cannot be begun without some action of the mind and will; that when the Holy Spirit has begun his work in us "neither the mind nor the will is inactive."

In his lectures on Melanchthon's *Loci,* which he continued to deliver to the close of his life, he asks the question: "Is the will in conversion absolutely passive, or is the will absolutely inactive in spiritual movements and actions?" He answers the question as follows: "Conversion is not a work of such a character that it is finished and perfected in all its parts in a single moment. But it has its beginnings, its progressive movements,

* *Examen,* pars I., *De Libero Arbitrio,* Scripturae Sententia.

by which it is perfected in great weakness. Therefore, it is not to be thought that with a careless and idle will I am to wait until renovation or conversion, according to the degrees mentioned, shall have been perfected by the action of the Holy Spirit without any action on my part. It cannot be shown with mathematical precision when the liberated will begins to act. But when prevenient grace, the primary beginnings of faith and of conversion are given to man, at once there begins a struggle of the flesh and of the Spirit, and it is manifest that that struggle cannot take place without the action of our will. While Moses is yet living the Holy Spirit struggles with him in opposition to his flesh in one way. Michael struggles in a different way against the Devil about the dead body of Moses. Also, in the beginning the desire is quite obscure, the assent quite languid, the obedience is quite slight. Those gifts ought to increase. But they increase in us not as a block of wood is moved forward by violent impact, nor as the lilies grow, without toil or care; but by striving, struggling, seeking, beseeching, pushing, and that not of ourselves. It is the gift of God, Luke 19:13. Giving the talents to the servants He says: Trade until I come, Matt. 15:26. He does not say, hide them in the earth. Paul also used a clear word, 2 Tim. 1:6: I exhort thee to stir up the gift of God that is in thee. He says that God, by the Word and by the divine afflatus, precedes us, moves and impels the will. But after this movement of the will, which has been made from above, the human will is not absolutely passive, but, moved and assisted by the Holy Spirit, it does not resist, but assents, and becomes a co-worker with God." Also: "Rightly is it said, There are three causes of a good action. 1. The Word of God, 2. The Holy Spirit, 3. The Human Will, provided it be rightly and properly understood."* Time and again does Chemnitz use the Augustinian formula: *When grace precedes, the will follows.* He says that "Saul had the Word of God, and the good Spirit of God urged him, that is, the two causes were present. But because he opposed the resistance of his will the Holy Spirit departed from him."*

In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper we have a combination of the language and of the conceptions of both Luther and Melanchthon. With Melanchthon he affirms the true and essential presence of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine in the Eucharist. But he does not base that presence as

* *Loci Communes,* Cap. VII.

Luther did in his *Greater Confession,* and as the Swabians did, following him, on the omnipresence of the human nature of Christ, but on the words of the institution and on the doctrine of the incarnation. Christ is present wherever he has promised to be present, wherever he wills to be present. "The Word of God tells us how Christ, according to his human nature, was conceived, born, walked on the earth, was crucified, buried, rose again, was taken up into heaven in a cloud, whence he shall come again at the last day. Meanwhile, until he shall visibly return to judgment, his body and his blood with bread and wine are administered in the Lord's Supper. This with good reason we can proclaim, preach and teach." He repudiates the idea that the body and blood of Christ dwell in wood or in stone. He held that in the Supper there is a threefold eating: 1. The physical eating of the bread, which is effected in a purely natural way. 2. The sacramental eating which Luther designated as bodily or oral eating. 3. The spiritual eating which is done by the heart through faith. The body of Christ is united with the bread in the sacrament. This is the sacramental union, but it is a mystery which we cannot understand in this life. But in the eating, the body of Christ is not bitten, nor torn by the teeth, neither does it undergo any change. As the body is truly and essentially present with the bread, so is it given us to eat.

"Hence it follows that those who receive and eat the sacrament receive the body and blood of Christ, which are truly and essentially present and are administered with the bread and wine to the mouth. Thus through this taking and eating the body of the Lord is united not only according to its power and effect, but also according to its essence; not only with the heart, spirit or soul through faith, but also with the heart, flesh and blood of those who receive the sacrament, and that, not in such a way that it is a perishable food of the stomach, but a heavenly eating for believers unto everlasting life, but for the unworthy unto condemnation. As to the manner in which all this takes place, only he knows who instituted and appointed this mystery. But in this life we can and should, neither by thought nor by words, imagine or explain it."

Here in the words, "With bread and wine" we have the characteristic phraseology of Melanchthon. In the words, "eating with the mouth," and "sacramental union," we have the characteristic phraseology of Luther. On the one hand Chemnitz stands opposed to that view of the Lord's Supper, known as

Crypto-Calvinism. On the other hand he stands equally opposed to the semi-idolatrous, semi-Romanizing view that arose among the Flacianists (see p. 323 *et seqq.*). All things considered he stands closer to Luther than he does to Melanchthon. "He was not a reformatory spirit. Moreover, he lacked the originality, the poesy and the living, the scientifically fruitful faith-intuition of a Luther; but he was the first and the most important theologian proceeding from the German Reformation." *

3. *Nicholas Selneccer.*

Nicholas Selneccer was born at Hersbruck, near Nürnberg, December 5 or 6, 1530. His father was a notary, but subsequently became town-clerk to Nürnberg. He was also numbered among the personal friends of Melanchthon. Nicholas possessed extraordinary musical talents. At the age of twelve years he was made organist in the court-chapel at a salary of eight *Thaler* and two cart loads of wood. He narrowly escaped being carried to Bohemia or to Spain as organist to King Ferdinand. He pursued classical studies in the Nürnberg Gymnasium. At the age of nineteen he was ready for the University, but did not begin his university studies at Wittenberg—and then as a law-student—until 1550. Melanchthon, who perceived the talents, the modesty and the piety of the young man, turned his attention to theology, which henceforth he pursued with great alacrity. Melanchthon was his favorite instructor, and in later years (1570) he declared that one of the greatest blessings of his life was that he "had had Melanchthon as his instructor, had heard him, had come into almost daily contact with him, had conversed with him, and had consulted him." In 1554 he obtained the Master's degree, and soon began to lecture in the University on philosophical and theological subjects. In 1557 he went to Dresden, first as court preacher, and then as director of the court choir. He was also entrusted with the education of the Electoral Prince, born February 21, 1554. He was also active while at Dresden with his pen. In 1565 he followed a call to Jena where the Philippistic tendency was in vogue. Two years later, upon the accession of Duke William, he lost his position. He then went to Leipzig where he became superintendent and pastor of the St. Thomas Church, and professor of theology in the University. He lectured with great applause on Melanchthon's *Loci*, and defended the churches of the Electorate against

* Dr. Theodor Pressel, *Martin Chemnitz*, p. 70.

attacks made upon them by the theologians of Jena. In the preface to his *Commentary on Genesis,* he expressed his decided agreement with the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum,** which was now the doctrinal standard of the Electorate. In 1570, without relinquishing his offices at Leipzig, he accepted a call to become General Superintendent and court-preacher in Wolfenbüttel, where he tried to introduce the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* as the norm of doctrine. In 1573 he published his *Institutio Religionis Christianae,*† and the next year he returned to Leipzig as superintendent, pastor and professor of theology. He was recognized as leader in the Lichtenberg Convention and wrote the *Opinion* addressed to the Elector; and while he contributed little or nothing directly to the *Torgau Book,* nor to the *Bergic Book,* he, nevertheless, coöperated so heartily with Andreae and Chemnitz that they three have been justly designated as "the triumvirate," a designation given by Chytraeus in 1581.

Selneccer remained in his office, as Superintendent at Leipzig, until May 17, 1589, when he was dismissed, because he persisted in warning his hearers against the errors of Calvinism. Later he became Superintendent at Hildesheim, where he faithfully discharged the duties of his office. He died at Leipzig, May 24, 1592. His body was buried with great pomp in the St. Thomas Church.

In theology, Selneccer was a pronounced Melanchthonian. This is shown not only by his expressions of admiration for the great Preceptor and by his numerous vindications of him against the calumniations of enemies, but especially by his own theological treatises. The *Paedagogia Christiana* is Melanchthonian to the core. The same in general is true of his *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, and is especially true in regard to the treatment of Free-will, where he uses the characteristic language and quotations employed by Melanchthon. Among other things he says: "The human will cannot be called the cause of conversion, since the thing to be converted is not the thing converting. But, since it is named *sunergon* (co-worker), it is shown to be nothing else than the will not inactive.

"These subjects are expounded in this way for the purpose

* Strobel, *Literatur-Geschichte,* pp. 223-4. Selneccer wrote as follows in regard to Melanchthon's *Loci:* "Non melior liber est ullus post biblia Christi, Quam qui doctrinae Corpusque locique vocantur." *Ut supra,* p. 224.

† The title-page of each volume bears the date 1573. The dedicatory epistle of Part I. is dated September, 1572. The dedicatory epistle of Part II. is dated December, 1571.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

of instruction, and they are true, and are acceptable to God. For the Holy Spirit does not convert a stone or a block or an ox or an ass, but a human being who is endowed by God with reason, and is created in the image of God, and who is able and ought to hear, to reflect and to understand. And, though man in his own nature since the Fall has become the enemy of God, nevertheless, as an enemy endowed with reason, he hears, understands and receives the reconciliation offered him by him whose enemy he is, and permits himself to be moved and to be turned to peace and becomes a friend. Thus man, hearing the promise of the Gospel and seeing the ambassador of God offering grace and peace, that is, hearing the Word and perceiving the moving of the Spirit in his heart, does not repel or reject the offered grace, but, joyfully inclined, submits to the divine voice and movement, as Paul says: Lord what wilt thou have me do?" *

Also: "Although the depravity and perversity of our nature is so great that the imagination of the human heart is evil from childhood, Gen. 8, and the carnal mind is enmity against God, Rom. 8, and contumacy in many ways resists God, as has been fully shown in the doctrine of original sin, nevertheless, in conversion itself the Holy Spirit so reforms the reason and so moves the will that man by nature an enemy of God and a child of wrath, now becomes a friend of God, and a son and an heir of God, understands and joyfully embraces God's goodness and grace, assents to the promise and in all things submits to the will of God, not indeed by natural human reason and will, but by the grace and by the efficacious action of the Holy Spirit, who instructs and illumines the reason and heals and reforms the will, but, nevertheless, in such a way that the reason and will are not inactive, but both suffering and in their own order doing something, and, to use the words of Luther, coöperating with the Spirit operating in us and renewing us not without us, that is, not contumaciously resisting or spurning, but admitting the Holy Spirit and accepting his grace and obeying and serving God, while the Holy Spirit moves and assists." †

And on pp. 284-5, after quoting 1 Cor. 3: "For we are workers together with God," Selneccer says: "Hence usually it is said that there are three causes of a right and good action, namely, the Word of God, the Holy Spirit and the human will not resisting the Word of God, nor shaking off the Holy Spirit, as Saul

* Page 88. † Pages 282-3.

shook him off by his own will." On pp. 294-5 he quotes the famous dicta of Chrysostom and Basil: "God draws, but draws him who is willing"; "Only will and God anticipates," and says: "The will is not inactive, nor does it behave like a statue, but it does something. For the will, when moved by the Holy Spirit, does not hold itself as a statue. Indeed, the power of following the drawing of God does not reside naturally in man. But when the Holy Spirit is received man acquires the power of obeying, and this is only of grace. . . . The ability to obey God is not in our power. This is true of man before grace, without the Word and the Holy Spirit.

"Man is able to obey God when He calls. This is true of man admonished, moved, and drawn by grace, by the Word and by the Holy Spirit.

"The will is not absolutely passive. This is true in two respects: 1. As already said, in external discipline. 2. In respect of the will moved by the Son of God.

"The will, as the attendant of the Holy Spirit, as the old saying proves: 'When grace precedes, the will follows.' "

"In the internal renewal of the heart three causes concur: The Word of God, the Holy Spirit and the will obeying. This is true of man, who has the Word of God and the beginnings of the renewing of the Spirit, or of the regenerate when they stand in spiritual conflict."

In his *Necessary Reply to the Calumnies of the Flacianists at Altenburg,* he denounces his antagonists, heaps upon them the vilest epithets, defends Major's proposition that *Good Works are Necessary to Salvation,* quotes Brentz in defense of the same proposition, calls himself "the grateful disciple of Melanchthon," defends the theological faculties of Wittenberg and Leipzig, and prays: "God preserve unto us our dear old preceptors and teachers, Major, Pfeffinger, Camerarius, Weller and others. We have only too few of them. God help us, their disciples and pupils." In this *Reply* he has a chapter *On Synergism,* in which he says: "All power and operation are alone of the Holy Spirit, who through the word spoken kindles and strengthens true faith and comfort in the hearts of men. But to this end man's will is required according to the order which God has established, because God himself challenges the will of man.

"And the will of man is not a material or physical subject, like straw, which, when laid on the fire, must burn, but it is a voluntary subject, which ought to hear, attend to and follow."

In expounding the doctrine of Free-will, Selneccer appeals to Brentz's *Apology* (see p. 362) and to the famous passage in St. Bernard's *Grace and Free-will* (see p. 362) in support of his own position—thus showing that he understood both Brentz and St. Bernard as teaching that there is some activity of the will in the appropriation of salvation. But Selneccer, like Melanchthon, taught with all emphasis that man does not operate *meritoriously,* or by the strength of his natural powers, but by not resisting, by not rejecting, by assenting, by consenting, by accepting, by submitting to the will of God, by obeying the divine call, in which the mind and the will are not inactive.*

His doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum* is set forth in the *Wittenberg Summary* and also in a monograph published at Heinrichstadt in 1571. He declares "that eternity and infinity are not to be attributed to the human nature." Both natures retain their own properties, and the actions of both natures are proper and peculiar. There is no confusion, but the properties are not to be separated. Christ is present wherever he has promised to be present, "as in the Supper, though this takes place contrary to and above every natural attribute"; that is, Selneccer advocates a voli-presence, or a multivoli-presence, in distinction from the Swabian doctrine of ubiquity.† He bases the presence of Christ in the Eucharist on the words of institution: " 'This is my body, this is my blood.' But here nothing is said about ubiquity or locality. Nor should the pious dispute about these things." He commits the mode of the presence to omnipotence and to the verity of Christ.‡

4. *David Chytraeus.*

David Chytraeus (Kochhaff), sometimes called the last of the Lutheran Fathers, was born at Ingelfingen, near Swabian Hall, in Würtemberg, February 26, 1530. He received the rudiments of his education at Gemmingen, where he advanced rapidly in his knowledge of the Latin language. At the age of nine years he entered the University of Tübingen. In the year 1544 he

* See the *Wittenberg Summary,* XCVIII. where it is said, against the Manichaeans, the Pelagians, the Schwenckfelders, the Enthusiasts and the Anabaptists: "We say that in conversion these three always concur: The Word of God, the Holy Spirit and the will of man assenting and not resisting the Word of God." This *Summary* was signed, May 5, 1570, by Selneccer in connection with the Wittenberg theologians.

† See *The Wittenberg Summary,* F. 2; Gieseler, IV., 463-4, note 25.

‡ *Institutiones,* II., 500, 501.

was made Magister under the name *David Kochhaff.* In that same year he went to Wittenberg, bearing from Brentz a letter of commendation to Luther, and to Melanchthon one of similar character from George Schwartzerd of Bretten. Melanchthon inquired of him: "Art thou already a Magister?" and asked him whether he had studied Greek. When the boy answered in the affirmative, Melanchthon handed him a copy of Thucydides and asked him to translate a passage into Latin. This he did so entirely to the satisfaction of the great preceptor that he exclaimed: "Rightly art thou Magister, and thou shalt be as dear to me as a son." Melanchthon was as good as his word; he at once admitted the young David to his table and took him into his house—"his David"—where he spent six years in the confidence and friendship of his teacher, who directed him in all the disciplines of the university. Luther's preaching made a profound impression upon him. He also heard lectures on philosophy, on medicine and on the natural sciences. In 1547 we find him in Tübingen, but in 1548 he returned to Wittenberg. From the year 1550 to the day of his death, June 25, 1600, he resided at Rostock, first as instructor in the Paedagogium, and then as professor in the University. He was honored with calls to numerous places of service, but he declined them all. He was active in almost all the important ecclesiastical movements of his day. His most important work is his *History of the Augsburg Confession,* German in the year 1576, Latin in the year 1578. His *Catechesis,* based on Melanchthon's Loci, 1556, and in many revised editions, was much used in schools and universities. His son, David Chytraeus, published at Hanover, in 1614, *Orationes et Epistolae Davidis Chytraei Theologi* in a volume of 1284 pages. In the year 1720, Otto Frid. Schütz published, at Hamburg, *Vita Davidis Chytraei* in two volumes, aggregating, with *Appendix,* 1049 pages. These two books contain a large amount of matter pertaining to the history of the Lutheran Church during the second half of the sixteenth century.

In theology, Chytraeus represents the Melanchthon type of doctrine with clearness and consistency. This is shown unequivocally in what he wrote on Free-will, on the Person of Christ, and relatively on the Lord's Supper.

1. In the *Catechesis,* edition of 1558, the question is asked: "What are the causes of faith?" The answer is as follows: "There are three":

"I. The Holy Spirit awakening in the mind the knowledge of

the Gospel in regard to the remission of sins for the sake of Christ, and moving the will so that it assents.

"II. The Word of God or the Gospel.

"III. The mind and will of man assenting to the Holy Spirit, struggling with doubt and believing the Gospel."

2. In the *Commentary on Genesis,* edition of 1558, we have the following: "The three causes of faith are to be united, namely:

"The Holy Spirit.

"Hearing and meditating on the Word of God.

"The will of man, which is not absolutely inactive, or absolutely passive; but it does something. It does not resist, but it assents to the Holy Spirit who operates through the Word. The doctrine of the coöperation of the will (*de synergia voluntatis*) we must firmly fix in our minds, so as not to nourish indifference, nor security, nor unbelief, nor despair in ourselves. Let the following sure and unanswerable arguments be kept constantly in view:

"I. Since the promise of grace is universal, God wills that all men shall be saved. Also, as I live I will not the death of the sinner. And it must not be thought that there are contradictory wills in God. If this be true, then it follows that there is some cause in us why some persons assent to the promise, and why others do not assent. Luke 13: I would have gathered you, but ye would not.

"II. It is evident that in the wills of the pious, who strive to assent to the promise of the Gospel, there are great and severe struggles and conflicts, as in Abraham, when he was striving with the angel; everyone experiences this daily in prayer. But if the Will, like the wax on which an imprint is made, were only passive and were absolutely without any action at all, then there would be no resistance, as when water is poured into a vessel.

"III. In 1 Cor. 3 and in 2 Cor. 6, Paul calls us coworkers with God.

"IV. We must not yield to doubt, distrust and security. These causes are strengthened because of the teaching of the Manichaeans.

"V. Because God is no respecter of persons, but is just, that is, truly impartial to all according to the one rule which he has given. Hence there is some cause in us why some accept the promise and why others are rejected."

This is the Melanchthonian doctrine of Free-will almost word

for word, in the essential features, as it is set forth by Melanchthon himself in the *Loci.* In an *Opinion* on the Bergic Book, 1578, in company with the other theological professors of Rostock, he declares that the "three concurring causes of conversion and repentance" and the dictum: "God draws, but draws those who believe," should have been explained, as had been done in the Torgau Formula, and should not have been unceremoniously condemned.* In his *Oration on the Study of Theology,* delivered before the University of Rostock, he declares that "in conversion the Will ought to assent to the Gospel and not resist it, and, so long as the Will resists, no conversion takes place, and when the Will assents, it does not assent unwillingly or by constraint, but voluntarily." †

3. In this same *Oration* he has a section on *The Person of Christ,* in which he says: "I have always held, and hold, that there is a constant difference between the divine and eternal creative nature and the human created nature, which, by the personal union and exaltation to the right hand of God, is carried above all angels and men, though not made equal to the divine, much less absorbed by the divine and destroyed. Nor do I wish knowingly and willingly ever to defend the Eutychians, or the madness of other sects, which have been condemned by the judgment of the true Church. The personal union is never defined otherwise than as a wonderful and ineffable copulation of the two natures in the person of the Son of God in such a way that the second person of the Deity, the Word of God and the human nature, assumed in the womb of Mary, constitute only one person or one individual Christ, on account of which union or most intimate communion of natures, all the properties and actions which belong originally to one nature only are really and truly communicated to the whole person of Christ in the con-

* Schütz, *Vita,* II., 466. To the same effect is the judgment of his contemporaries, the Wismar theologians. Schütz, II., p. 436. In the *Opinion* of the Rostock divines (1578) on the matter of concord in the Church it is declared that "the doctrine of Free-will in the Latin Confession and Apology was so shaped in words as not expressly to condemn the doctrine of the Papists and the Synergists, as at the time of the delivery of the Confession (as the Acta prove) the Papists declare that they agree with us absolutely on this subject. Rightly, therefore, should the passages of the Confession and Apology be omitted, since they contribute nothing to the sure confirmation of our doctrine or to the refutation of the Synergists." Schütz, *Vita,* II., p. 466.

† *Orationes,* p. 490. This *Oratio* is without date, but that it was delivered while some of the subjects of which it treats were in violent controversy "among some adherents of our Confession," is made certain by numerous references.

crete; nor can there be any other real and true *communicatio idiomatum* in the person of Christ."

He asserts that Christ is present wherever he has promised in his Word to be present. Ubiquity, in the Swabian sense, he condemns and execrates, and regards as "monstrous." *

4. In the *Catechesis,* editions of 1557 and 1579 alike, in answer to the question, "What is the Lord's Supper?" he gives the answer: "The Lord's Supper is a holy act instituted by the Son of God, in which, by taking bread and wine the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are taken." † In the *Oration* from which we have quoted twice he treats the Lord's Supper wholly on its practical side as "a memorial of Christ's great love towards us." In a *Judgment* on the Frankfort *Recess* dated August 14, 1558, the Rostock Theological Faculty writes: "Because the words of Christ: Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you, this is my blood which is shed for you, are so often repeated word for word in the Holy Scriptures as are no other means of faith, no pious Christian who believes that Christ our Lord is truthful and almighty can doubt that these words are to be understood as they read, namely, that in the Lord's Supper, held according to the institution of Christ, the body and the blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, and are administered to those who receive the sacrament, as this article was clearly set forth in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, and as afterwards at Schmalkald Luther and all the other theologians understood this article, which reads as follows: Of the Lord's Supper we hold that bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are the true body and blood of Christ and are administered to and received not only by pious, but also by wicked Christians." ‡

It is the generic Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper that is here held, in expressed antithesis to the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation on the one hand, and in expressed antithesis to the Sacramentarian doctrine of a virtual presence on the other hand. There is no intimation of the extreme position which had been asserted and proclaimed by Flacianists and others. And as to Chytraeus's thoroughly Melanchthonian attitude in general, we have that set forth in a letter dated May 22, 1574, in which he affirms his unqualified endorsement of the

* *Orationes,* pp. 485-7.
† Pp. F. 2, 131.
‡ Schütz, *Vita Chytraei,* I., p. 345.

Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum, and of the *Examen Ordinandorum,* which had been published twenty-two years before that time, and before the controversies had arisen.*

5. *Andrew Musculus.*

Andrew Musculus was born at Schneeberg, in Saxony, in the year 1514. He received his preparatory education at the Latin School in his native town. In 1531 he entered the University of Leipzig, where he received the Bachelor's degree, February 21, 1534. He then was employed as a private teacher of some young nobles in Amberg. In 1538 he entered the University of Wittenberg, where he obtained the Master's degree, September 18, 1539. He attended the lectures of both Melanchthon and Luther. For the latter he conceived a great admiration, and regarded him as the greatest man who had lived on the earth since the days of the apostles, declaring that "there is as great a difference between the dear old teachers and Luther as there is between the light of the sun and that of the moon; and beyond all doubt, the ancient Fathers, even the best and chiefest among them, as Hilary and Augustine, had they lived contemporaneously with him, would not have hesitated to deliver the lamp to him, as the saying is." Of course, then he was a disciple of Luther and not of Melanchthon. Indeed, he has been characterized as an anti-Philippistic zealot. Luther's steadfastness and decision suited his type of mind, which was decidedly polemical, and which was sharpened in the direction of polemics by the circumstances that surrounded him. One of his biographers says that "polemic was the element of his life," and that "he always saw lions and dragons in his opponents, and felt himself called upon to couch a lance and sally forth against them."

In the year 1541 he found employment in the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder. In the year 1544 he was made ordinary professor in the University and chief pastor. Subsequently he was made General Superintendent. In these positions he remained to the day of his death, September 29, 1581. He preached by preference on death, the judgment, damnation, the devil, hell, the end of the world, in the most realistic manner. His preaching was popular, though his sermons were generally two hours in length. He enjoyed the protection and support of the Prince, and exerted wide influence in the direction of rigid Lutheranism. He took part in the composition of the Torgau

* *Epistolae,* pp. 175-6.

Book in 1576, as we have already learned, and was present at Bergen in May, 1577, when the Torgau Book was transformed into the Bergic Book. On almost all points of theology Musculus went to extremes. In the excess of his antinomianism he called Moses "a hireling (Bauernknecht), who forces and drives, scolds and lashes, curses and execrates the ungodly." * In regard to the proposition: "Good works are necessary," he broke out from the pulpit: "All they are of the devil who teach that new obedience is necessary. The *must* is not in place here. You say that new obedience is necessary, but not to salvation. One devil is as good as the other. Good works are necessary to salvation—good works are necessary, but not to salvation—these are two pairs of pantaloons from the same piece of cloth." In certain articles on the Lord's Supper, written in the year 1572 for subscription by the ministers, he says: "There is no place in which the Son of God is according to the divine nature where the Son of man is not according to the human nature." He declares that Christ, from the moment of his conception, "is subject to none of the necessary conditions of physical location; nor is he shut in by any local boundaries, nor circumscribed necessarily by the limitations of locality," † which is ubiquitarianism in the most unqualified form.

6. *Christopher Koerner.*

Christopher Koerner was born at Buchen, in Franconia, in the year 1518. In his thirteenth year he began the study of the languages and of theology under his relative, Conrad Wimpina. In the year 1540 he began to teach in the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder. In the year 1564 he was made ordinary professor in the University, and in 1581 he became General Superintendent of Mark Brandenburg. He died March 18, 1594. Because of his learning he was called "the eye of the University." He was at the Torgau Convention in 1576, at Bergen in May, 1577, at Tangermünde, March, 1578, at Schmalkald in October, 1578, and at Jüterbogk in January, 1579. He was a true Lutheran, but was by no means so passionate, so controversial, so one-sided, as was his colleague, Musculus. In 1568 he was in essential agreement with George Major and Victorine Strigel, whom he called sound teachers.‡

* G. Frank, *Geschichte der Prot. Theologie*, I., 149. See also Döllinger, *Die Reformation*, III., 527.

† Gieseler, IV., 464, note 25.

‡ Schütz, *Vita Davidis Chytraei*, II., 436.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE CENSURES OF THE TORGAU BOOK.

During the Summer and Autumn of the year 1576, numerous ecclesiastical conventions were held for the purpose of examining the Torgau Book. The official conclusions reached, generally called *censures,* were sent to the Elector of Saxony. The majority of them reached Dresden by the first of February, 1577. Some of the censures approved the Torgau Book with little or no qualification whatever. Some objected to it in part, and offered suggestions of improvement; some rejected the Book almost *in toto.*

A collection of the censures has not been published. But quite the majority, and the more important of them, are found, either in full text or in substance, or in large extracts, in the histories of Hospinian, Hutter, Schütz, Anton, Planck, Heppe and Gieseler; and to these sources we refer those who are in search of fuller information on this subject than can be given in this history.

1. *Holstein.*

Holstein, in the Gottorp and Hadersleben part, maintained in substance as follows: 1. That the existing normal writings are sufficient for the decision of the points in dispute. 2. That by a new symbolical book the calumnies of the opponents would be strengthened. 3. That by the same, errors which had vanished away would be revived to confuse men's minds. 4. That in it, too, there were many new modes of statement and disputations, about which new and dangerous divisions would spring up. Particularly did it seem "as if it was intended by this work to put the poor Church into confusion with the new paradoxes which vegetated and were sent forth in the book of Master Brentz, *De Majestate Christi,*" 1564. The Elector was advised to adhere to his *Corpus Doctrinae,* but to exclude from it, in the *Loci Communes,* "the two paragraphs in the section on Free-will, which were not there in the life-time of holy father Luther," and to add the Schmalkald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther and Melanchthon's *Sententiae Patrum de Coena Domini.* They say that if further explanation be needed, they have "the other books of

Luther and of his faithful helpers, which were written while Luther was living, and by him were approved, in which will be found the clear teaching of Luther and of his true fellow-confessors of the Augsburg Confession while Luther lived," and they close with the earnest admonition "that everything which in the future may be brought into controversy shall be decided according to Holy Scripture and the writings of Luther." In regard to the other part of Holstein, Duke John the Younger writes to the Elector, November 18, 1576, that, having compared the Torgau Book with Holy Scripture, the ancient symbols, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology and Luther's Catechism, he finds them all in full accord, and he declares that he will persevere in this faith to the end of his life, and will earnestly hold his subjects to the same.*

2. *Würtemberg, Baden and Henneberg.*

The theologians of these three principalities declare, September 15, 1576, that they find the pure doctrine in each and every article of the Torgau Book, and that every article is in harmony with the Maulbronn Formula. They suggest verbal and formal changes in numerous places. They desire that the article on the Will be better guarded against misunderstanding. They say that though God does not force man to be converted, yet he draws the man whom he wishes to convert in such a way that his darkened understanding becomes enlightened and his refractory Will becomes obedient. They request that the passages: "The will of man in conversion is not inactive, but does something," and: "God draws, but draws him who is willing," be expunged, since according to the letter they are not correct, and attribute too much to the will. They also ask for a better explanation of the word *spiritual* in the article on the Lord's Supper, so as to have it mean in a supernatural and heavenly manner, as against the Capernaites, and as against the sacramentarian use of the word in the sense of union with Christ. They disapprove the designation of the bread and wine as "instruments by which Christ imparts his body and blood."

3. *Hesse.*

The theologians of Hesse issued their censure at Cassel, Sep-

* For Holstein and Schleswick, see Gieseler, IV., p. 484; *Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*, 1850, pp. 638 *et seqq.*; Heppe, III., pp. 173 *et seqq.*; Hutter, fol. 102. *Dänische Bibliothek*, 6 Bd. pp. 333 *et seqq.*

tember 5, 1576. It disapproves more in the Torgau Book than it approves. It objects that the word "unaltered" has been prefixed to the Augsburg Confession, notwithstanding the fact that at Naumburg, in 1561, the Princes had approved the editions of 1540 and 1542 "as amended, enlarged and explained from the Holy Scripture." The censure objects that the private writings of Luther should "be cited as the common consent of the churches," inasmuch as such writings are not always consistent; nor did Luther himself lay much stress on them. The theologians feel that such a procedure is a Babylonian captivity.* They object to the exclusion of Melanchthon's writings, especially of the *Corpus Doctrinae,* which had been approved in Electoral Saxony, as also in Hesse, and which had been useful in training so many persons in the true faith.

The theologians approve the articles on Original Sin, Free-will, Justification, Good Works and The Third Use of the Law, as in harmony with their own teaching. In discussing the article on the Lord's Supper, they endorse the language of Melanchthon and approve the Wittenberg Concord of 1536, and disapprove the use of "the vehement and harsh word *condemn,*" as applied to those who oppose the Lutheran doctrine. They approve the article on the Person of Christ as essentially correct, and understand that the human nature of Christ is omnipotent and omniscient, not *per se* or *ex se,* but on account of the divine nature, with which it is inseparably united. They raise no objection to the article on the Descensus ad Inferos. They approve the articles on Adiaphora and Predestination—to all of which must be added the letter of the Landgraves William and Ludwig to the Elector, in which, under date of September 10, 1576, they present numerous objections to the Torgau Book.†

4. *Neuberg, Simmern and Zweibrücken.*

At first the clergy of Neuberg were not disposed to subscribe the Torgau Book as a confession of their faith, on account of its ubiquitarianism. But August 8, 1576, they declared themselves willing to accept it with heart, and mouth, and hand, provided antitheses be added to the ninth and eleventh articles, and that the article on The Descensus be either more accurately defined or be expunged.‡

* Heppe, III., pp. 349 *et seqq.*

† Hospinian, fols. 65 *et seqq.*, 69 *et seqq.*; Heppe, *Confessionelle Entw. der Hessischen Kirche* (1853), p. 10; Gieseler, IV., p. 484, note 11.

‡ Heppe, III., p. 168.

The theologians of Simmern thought that the authors of the Torgau Book should show more appreciation of the authority of Melanchthon and of the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum*. Nevertheless, the Palsgrave, in sending the censure of his theologians to the Elector of Saxony, January 8, 1577, promised to do all in his power to advance the work of concord.*

The theologians of Zweibrücken declare, September 13, 1576, that they find the Torgau Book in complete harmony with the Scriptures and with the confessions of the Church, and say that they are ready to subscribe all the articles with mouth and hand. But they object to subscribing Luther's doctrinal and polemical writings, and in this way establishing a human authority, since Luther's writings should not be used for proving, but for illustrating. They desire that the many patristic quotations found in the book should be eliminated. They desiderate some things in the articles on the Lord's Supper and the Person of Christ. They express the wish that the article on the Descensus should be either omitted or improved in the explanation. In the article on Predestination they miss the antithesis.

These suggestions are commended to the favorable consideration of the authors of the Torgau Book, with the promise of submission to their authority.†

5. *Pomerania.*

The Synod of Pomerania met at Wolgast, January 22, 1577. The theologians declare that, inasmuch as the Torgau Book is intended to supplant the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum*, they feel compelled to witness that Melanchthon's public writings contain nothing contrary to the orthodox doctrine; that Melanchthon had always maintained the true and essential presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and had taught that the Lord's Supper is an act in which with the bread and wine Christ gives his body and blood. They are confident that Melanchthon's doctrine of Free-will, as set forth in the Latin *Loci*, can be vindicated as orthodox. Hence they had retained the said *Corpus* in their schools, and had admonished all their preachers to study it with diligence. Melanchthon's definition of the Gospel as the preaching of repentance they declared to be truly Christian, genuinely scriptural and soundly Lutheran. His doctrine of justification is also perfectly orthodox, since he teaches that justification must always be joined with repentance and new obedience. They

* Heppe, *ut supra*. † Heppe, *ut supra*. Hospinian, fol. 70.

recommend that, since the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* is in harmony with the Holy Scriptures, all the Estates, the teachers and the preachers and the people shall steadfastly maintain this form of doctrine and transmit it to posterity. They declare that "it has disturbed and troubled them that only the unaltered Augsburg Confession is ever and anon spoken of, and that such unjust judgments and condemnation have been permitted against the authority of the corrected and altered edition. They desire that the *Confessio Saxonica* shall be retained. In general they would not oppose the Torgau Book should it be brought into their country, provided it be received in connection with their own *Corpus Doctrinae.*" *

6. *Anhalt.*

The theologians of Anhalt were ardently attached to Melanchthon and were opposed to the ultra-Lutheran orthodoxy which had been developed in parts of Saxony. It was but natural that they should express themselves against the Torgau Book. They object to the prolixity of the book, and object that in a formula which is meant to promote the welfare of the Church, so much should be said against the ancient and modern heretics, "for, what have we to do with those who are without?"

"Besides, it is to us especially painful that in this book the old love and fidelity which are forever due to the dear departed Philip Melanchthon is entirely forgotten; that his views should be ignored, and that in this book not one word should be said about his faithful work and glorious name. Hence it is a matter of solicitude that the authors of the Torgau Book shall not expose themselves to the suspicion of having wished 'to separate from each other the two faithful heroes, Luther and Philip, who in these last times have been raised up together by the grace of God for the salvation and honor of the Church—and who have brought us all to victory—canonizing the one and making the other a stench, and seeking their own honor through the downfall of this one.' The theologians of Electoral Saxony should not make such a mistake, 'especially since the most distinguished among them at Wittenberg, Rostock, Tübingen and elsewhere, both publicly and privately, not without high praise and profit, have lectured to us and others on Philip's *Loci Communes;* and they have presented Philip's *Examen,* on which so many thousands have prepared themselves for their examinations, and on which they themselves were instructed and ordained.' They

* Planck, VI., 496 *et seqq.;* Heppe, III., 146 *et seqq.*

cannot believe that it is the purpose to exclude Melanchthon's books from the churches and schools, 'since many a time, by a single definition, he has brought more light into the school than at present it is possible for us all to do with our books—should this be done, then we have before us a new danger which no one can resist. A wide-spread barbarism will follow.' ''

The censure expresses essential agreement with the Torgau Book on the doctrine of Sin, but prefers Melanchthon's brevity of statement to the prolixity of the Torgau Book. It objects decidedly to the doctrine of Free-will as set forth in the book, and defends Melanchthon's use of the three causes. It declares that the proposition: ''Man is converted while resisting,'' is a buskin, and says that the expression, ''passive capacity,'' is unusual. It expresses itself in favor of the Melanchthonian teaching on the doctrine of justification, and says that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are imparted to the worthy and to the unworthy, to the former for the confirmation of their faith, to the latter unto condemnation.*

To this censure must be added the declaration of the Anhalt theologians *On the Person, Majesty and Office of Christ,* in sixty brief propositions, in which they affirm an anti-Swabian Christology, but maintain a real hypostatic union of the two natures of Christ, and declare that ''the assumed human nature co-operates not only meritoriously, but also by the efficacy of the Logos in all things which pertain to the office of the Saviour.'' The presence of the body of Christ in the Supper of the Lord they ''believe on account of the words of the institution.'' †

7. *Ansbach.*

Andreae had commended the Torgau Book to the theologians of Ansbach and had solicited their subscription to the same, even before it had been sent to them. Later, when they had received a copy and had examined it, September 3, 1576, they rejected the formula with emphasis.‡ The next Spring, April 19, 1577, the theologians of Nürnberg declared that ''they stand by the old Confession of the city, and had warned the town council to have nothing to do with the controversies and differences of other churches, as they were unnecessary and dangerous, nor should they disturb the churches of the city with them, or

* Semler, pp. 33-37; Planck, IV., 507 *et seqq.;* Heppe, pp. 177 *et seqq.*
† Given by Heppe, III., 386 *et seqq.*
‡ Heppe, III., 188, 189.

create a troublesome faction, as has been already done by correspondence with foreign theologians.'' *

8. *Magdeburg.*

The theologians of Magdeburg delivered their censure to the Administrator December 21, 1576. The censure concedes in general that the Torgau Book contains much that is good, but it declares that some parts of it are contrary to the truth. ''They wish, by all means, that the writings of Melanchthon, which had been hitherto received and subscribed in so many electorates and principalities, had been allowed to remain.'' They enter especially on a defense of Melanchthon's *Loci* and of the changes made in the later editions of the Augsburg Confession. ''This last,'' they say, ''was by no means undertaken by him without consideration; but by the command of Electors and Princes, and with the foreknowledge, approval, counsel and assistance of Luther and other distinguished theologians in these lands, he revised the Confession, which did not remain in the new edition as a private writing; but, just like the first, it was subscribed and approved by the Protestant Estates. The improvements which it contains can as little be suspected as those which Luther from time to time introduced into his German translation of the Bible. No one ever regarded them as corruptions.'' As regards Melanchthon's *Loci,* they (the theologians) do not hesitate to avow that from this book, next to the Bible, they have learned all their theology, and have drawn mainly from it; all the time they have been in office they have instructed other people in church and school from it.

But finally they concede that they have not found in the *Loci* a theology that differs from that contained in the Torgau Book. ''Hence, in regard to doctrine they (the theologians) are one in every respect, and they only wish that, in method, some things be changed, and especially that all personalities shall be omitted.'' †

9. *Brunswick.*

The theologians of the Duchy met at Riddagshausen, August 9, 1576, for the purpose of passing judgment on the Torgau Book. Their censure, which in all probability was written by Chemnitz, takes up the Torgau Book, article by article, and approves all the articles without qualification, though with an occasional sugges-

* Pressel in *Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie,* 1867, p. 28.
† Semler, pp. 31, 32; Planck, VI., 519.

tion, and with the recommendation that a general synod shall be held, and that the following points shall be considered:

1. That the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* be no longer held as a norm of faith. 2. That the Calvinistic books which had made their appearance in Electoral Saxony should be rejected. 3. That all books which are inconsistent with or contrary to the proposed formula of confession be condemned and rejected. 4. That the proposed formula of confession shall be preached and taught in all the schools and churches; nor shall anyone be allowed to defend or countenance the errors which it condemns. 5. That a formula of subscription be devised, "so that everyone in his subscription must confess that with heart, mouth and pen, in thesis and in antithesis, he approves this formula of confession throughout." 6. That everyone is to condone and forget the private injuries that he may have suffered in this long period of controversy. 7. That the press is to be guarded, so that no one shall print his opinions as he may choose; also theological writings shall be subjected to examination and approval by learned and unsuspected persons, with reference to their agreement with the formula of confession, before they shall be printed. 8. That churches and schools shall be officially visited for the purpose of ascertaining whether the teaching is in harmony with the formula of confession, both in thesis and in antithesis. Those who teach and persist in defending opposing views are to be put out of office.*

10. *Mecklenburg.*

The censure of the theologians of Rostock and Mecklenburg was delivered to the Duke of Mecklenburg at Rostock, October 16, 1576. They say that "the entire statement made at Torgau, as regards the explanation of the true doctrine, the rejection of errors, and the treatment of the whole controversy about religion, is approved throughout in all the articles; and we heartily desire that it may serve well and happily for a true and permanent unity of the churches which subscribe to the Christian Augsburg Confession." They make a few unimportant suggestions, which they think would contribute to perspicuity and to the avoidance of errors in the future.†

11. *Brandenburg.*

The Elector John George first instructed his counsellors as to

* Hutter, III., *et seqq.*; Planck, VI., 459 *et seqq.*

† See the entire Censure in Schütz, *Vita Chytraei*, II., Appendix, pp. 48 *et seqq.*

the way in which they should examine the Torgau Book. Then he called a convention of his chief clergy, including the Court Preacher Coelestin, and of his principal professors, including Musculus and Koerner, to meet at Lebus. August 4, 1576, the assembled theologians report that they have examined the Torgau Book in all its parts "with special diligence, according to the rule of the Holy Scripture and the teaching of Luther, and have found that in this book all the subjects have been treated and in a Christian manner." Hence, aside from a few insignificant points, they are perfectly satisfied with the entire treatment of the book, and are heartily thankful to the Holy Trinity for the truth here set forth. They desire that to the articles on Original Sin, Free-will, the Difference between the Law and the Gospel, and the Third Use of the Law, quotations should be added from the writings of Luther.

But it is evident that this censure represented chiefly, if not entirely, the sentiment of the clergy assembled at Lebus and that of John George; for the next year the majority of the ministers of Brandenburg expressed themselves in decided opposition to the censure, and declared their dissatisfaction with the exclusion of Melanchthon and his writings, and with the introduction of a new system of doctrine.*

12. *The Cities of Lower Saxony.*

The churches of Goslar, Brunswick, Hildesheim, Göttingen, Hanover, Nordheim, Hameln, Eimbeck and Höxter delivered their censure at a synod held in Brunswick, November 14, 1576. They declare that the Torgau Book agrees almost word for word with the Swabian-Saxon Concordia, which they had approved the previous year. The additions have been taken from the writings of Luther. The theologians declare that they teach in their churches, both in thesis and in antithesis, the doctrine that is inculcated in this formula. This same doctrine they will maintain in their ministry and before the civil authorities, in church and in school, and they "will uphold it, not only before the living, but will bequeath it as a *deposit* to posterity. Hitherto in our ministry we have opposed with voice and pen the corruptions, and, God knows, we have done it with no end in view except that everything which is contrary to sound doctrine, everything which for years has been creeping in, and is contrary to the canon of the divine Word and to the old Lutheran *Corpus Doc-*

* Semler, pp. 8-10, 20, 21; Heppe, III., p. 135.

trinae and to this formula, may be clearly and expressly cast out and rejected, and that the churches may be warned." *

They make insignificant suggestions for the improvement of the articles. For instance, in the article *On Predestination* they declare that in that part of the country the doctrine of predestination has been violently discussed, "the one party saying predestination is universal, or is to be understood *universaliter;* the other party contends that it is particular, or that it is to be understood *particulariter,* and everyone explains his view as he wishes. Therefore we pray that a declaration in the formula may be attached to the phrases, so that such disputes may be repressed by public authority."

They express themselves as unwilling that Melanchthon's writings should be wholly rejected. But they are not willing that they shall be regarded as normative. "His doctrine of Free-will, of the definition of the Gospel, of the Lord's Supper, etc., are debatable, and are not entirely in harmony with the writings of Luther." They should be subjected to the writings of Luther. They pray that in a preface, or at the end of the proposed formula, a statement should be made as to the way in which the books of Melanchthon and Dr. Major should be read. They ask that the books of Flacius, Spangenberg, Irenaeus, Strigel, Stössel, Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Martyr, and those condemned at Lichtenberg and Torgau, be mentioned by name in a preface or in an appendix to the formula. Also they ask that a general clause shall be added in regard to certain books issued by the Wittenberg and Leipzig professors, and that a censorship be erected over the press to see that no book is published, "under any pretext," which is opposed to "the aforesaid formula," that is, to the Torgau Book. "So, indeed, must the young and those who protest know quod fuerit judicium ecclesiae horum temporum de hujusmodi scriptis." †

13. *Lübeck, Hamburg and Lüneburg.*

In a convention held at Möln, October 30th to November 2d, "the theologians of the three cities named above express anew their approval of the Swabian-Saxon Concordia and declare at the same time, in reference to the Torgau Book, that in the same the earlier formula is 'in some parts improved, and without any

* Translation slightly condensed.

† This censure is given in full text by Rehtmeyer, III., Beylagen, pp. 261 *et seqq.* See Hutter, fol. 113*b*.

change of substance, enlarged by necessary explanations.' But by means of this explanation they did not mean to abolish the older confessions or to effect a political confederation. Much rather is this to be only a public testimony of the doctrine which has been confessed in these churches 'from the beginning of the reformed religion.'

"The desideria expressed in regard to the Torgau Book have reference to things almost entirely unessential. In general, there is a demand for a sharper expression of the exclusive Lutheran character of the formula and for a more decided separation of the Confession, as over against the Calvinistic and Melanchthonian peculiarity. The convention also cites and rejects the Philippistic and Flacianist books which had appeared in Electoral Saxony (to which they wished to have added expressly Melanchthon's opinion on the Heidelberg sacramental affair and the books of Flacius, Irenaeus and Spangenberg on original sin). The censorship of the press, the establishment of a definite formula of subscription, the removal of erroneous teachers, and the like, covering the same propositions which the Riddagshausen Convention had suggested, should be laid before the next General Synod." *

14. *Prussia.*

Margrave George Frederick of Brandenburg-Ansbach was at this time administrator of the Duchy of Prussia. Tilemann Heshuss, as we have already learned, was Bishop of Sammland. He had the Torgau Book copied and sent to the pastors and to Dr. Wigand for examination. His private opinion of the Torgau Book we read on p. 430 *et seqq.*

The Administrator ordered Heshuss and Wigand each to render an opinion on the Torgau Book. December 17, 1576, at a conference held in Königsberg, the two opinions were examined. Heshuss was instructed to make one censure out of the two opinions, and to have regard to the observations made by the members of the conference. The censure was then signed by the two Bishops, Heshuss and Wigand, and by six other clergymen. The censure pronounces the Torgau Book in general "a glorious and excellent book." It sets forth that the divisive and ruinous religious controversies have been completely and thoroughly discussed, explained and stated, and that in all the twelve articles, in so far as the chief thing is concerned, the doctrine is presented well and properly, in harmony with the Word of God and the

* Heppe, III., 131-2.

Augsburg Confession, and that the opposing doctrine is rightly rejected, and is confuted with good reasons from the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures. The theologians declare that had the Wittenberg and Leipzig theologians taught, after Luther's death, as it is taught in this book, they would never have written a line against them. They rejoice that the Elector of Saxony has rejected the polemical writings published against the teaching of Luther, and that he has now become the patron and promoter of Luther's doctrine. They approve the use of "the unaltered Augsburg Confession which was delivered to the Emperor Charles V. anno 1530."

In regard to Jacob Andreae they have this to say: "Inasmuch as Dr. Jacob Andreae has sinned grievously against God and has greatly scandalized the entire Church of God, in that he has tried to reconcile the views of Luther and Calvin, as at Weimar, in regard to the *Confutation of the Dukes of Saxony* and *The Declaration of Victorine* (Strigel) [see p. 361 *et seqq.*], which are directly contrary the one to the other, in consequence of which innocent teachers were cruelly slandered and persecuted, as his book sent to the Roman Emperor in anno 1570 shows, therefore the Word of God requires of him that he publicly confess such dreadful sin, beg the pardon of the Church, and do heartily repent. But until this shall have been done it is a very dangerous thing for pious and God-fearing people to subscribe a confession with him in such a way as not to make themselves partakers of another man's sins and as not to strengthen Dr. Jacob in his impenitence. But if Dr. Jacob will acknowledge his fall and will truly repent, then they should be ready as Christians to forgive and to forget all injuries that have been inflicted, and to receive him as a brother and a fellow-servant of Jesus Christ."

In their censure of the article, *Of Supposed Free-will*, these Prussian theologians demand, among other things, the following:

1. That the paragraph in which the Torgau Book treats the passage, Gal. 3:24: "The law is our schoolmaster," etc., in a Melanchthonian sense, be supplanted by Luther's explanation of the same passage. 2. That the comparison by which the Torgau Book likens the natural mind and will of man to our eyes, which see the earth, but cannot behold the bright sun, be dropped, because it is too weak, since the natural understanding is stark blind and dead to good. 3. That the declaration that the question, whether man, before, in, and after conversion, resists the Holy

Spirit, is only a scholastic dispute, be not so understood, "for Luther was not a scholastic disputer when he earnestly and justly contended for the *purè passivè.*" 4. That the declaration of Melanchthon, *Hominis voluntas in conversione non est otiosa* (which in the Torgau Book is explained in the Melanchthonian sense), be supplanted by these words: *"Most correctly does Luther contend that man in conversion is absolutely passive."* 5. That the "three concurring causes," which in the Torgau Book had received a somewhat Melanchthonian explanation, be rejected as dangerous and false, and as favorable to the Synergists. 6. That the oft-quoted dictum of Chrysostom: "God draws, but draws him who is willing," be rejected as false and Pelagianizing; and they close this part of their censure by saying that Melanchthon's teaching on Free-will, as contained in the *Loci* and in the *Examen Ordinandorum,* and in his other writings, and in the teaching of Strigel and others on the same subject and the "three efficient causes," are rejected by them, "because they are contrary to the Word of God."

In the articles, *On Good Works,* the *Law and the Gospel,* and the *Third Use of the Law,* they find that the opposition to Melanchthon has not been made sufficiently definite. They deem it highly important that Melanchthon's letter to the Elector of the Palatinate, and his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as set forth in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians,* should be named and rejected, and that the authors and patrons of corruptions should be named and condemned, in order that the people may be guarded against them. "In regard to Philip nothing is to be done! He now has his doom (Gericht), and we would hope that he has repented, and that God has in Christ forgiven him his sins and errors. We must act with reference to the poor youth and the plain people, and especially with reference to posterity, so that they cannot be led into such errors by the writings of Philip, but can read them with prudence and warning. We are heartily certain that, should the names of the authors and patrons of corruptions be passed over in silence in this Formula of Concord, then it will go forth as a piece of jugglery and not from the heart. The Concordia will not last long, for Ezekiel will cry at the window: 'The prophets have daubed them with untempered mortar.' The rain will quickly remove such daubing. He who does not reject false doctrines with names, does not act from the heart. He may print and subscribe until the storm be past. As soon as another

wind blows he will sing his old song: He never rejected the view of Philip." *

Of all the censures of the Torgau Book, this, which was sent to Dresden in the name of the Prussian Lutheran Church, is the most outspokenly anti-Melanchthonian. It not only condemns the writings of Melanchthon, but it also catalogues their author with the false teachers in the Church, and seeks to blot out his name from the Church which he helped to bring into existence, and which he served with a wealth of learning, an ardor of zeal, and a sincerity of purpose, such as have not been surpassed in all the annals of Christianity. He, who had been Luther's faithful friend and co-worker, and whom Luther loved and trusted as he loved and trusted no other man, is henceforth to be known and remembered as a heretic! His name is to stand as a monument of dishonor in the Formula of Concord which was devised for the purpose of uniting all the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. Luther—chiefly the Luther of controversy—is not only placed at the head—as is eminently proper and right that he should be—but he is to be made, and is to be recognized as, the sole criterion for Lutheranism. Such had been the contention of the Flacianists. The authors of the Torgau Book, in the face of their own antecedents, had in large measure yielded to this contention. Hence Heshuss and Wigand, the only remaining Flacianists of influence, could agree with the Torgau Book in essentials, and with confidence they could demand further concessions in the direction of their own one-sided and exclusive Lutheranism. The demands made by the Prussian censure were, in their essential features, conceded in the transformation of the Torgau Book in the Bergic Book. The article on Free-will was made decidedly Flacianistic.† Melanchthon's writings are not, indeed, condemned, neither is Melanchthon catalogued as a heretic. But both himself and his writings are passed by in silence. Hence, all things considered, it can be truthfully said that the Prussian censure imparted the character of *Lutherism,* rather than that of Lutheranism, to the work of

* The Prussian Censure has not been printed in full. It is found in the Kgl. Staatarchiv zu Königsberg, Pr. Briefarchiv, J. 2. It is dated January 8, 1577. The present writer possesses a certified copy of the original, made at his request and cost in 1905. Some parts of the original have become illegible. It is indispensable for understanding the history of the Bergic Book. See brief summary in Hutter, fols. 249, 250; and a much more complete summary by Heppe, III., 137 *et seqq.*

† See Thomasius, *Das Bekenntniss,* p. 144; Luthardt, *Die Lehre vom Freien Willen,* p. 272; G. Frank, Herzog,² XV, p. 111.

Concord. In so far as it approved the Torgau Book, it, no doubt, surpassed the expectations of Chemnitz, Andreae and Selneccer. The natural effect of such approval would be to create in the authors of the book a readiness to comply with further requisitions, since the success of the work of Concord now depended mainly, if not entirely, on the final attitude of the Prussians.

And now, if we analyze the censures, of which there are said to have been twenty-five,* the more important of which we have exhibited in substance, we at once discover that they greatly differ in character and value, as was stated at the beginning of this chapter. That representing the larger part of Holstein is decidedly unfavorable. The same is true, though to a smaller extent, with the censures of principalities in the Palatinate, of Anhalt, Hesse, Pomerania and Magdeburg. In some cases the censures from these countries are ambiguous, rather than hostile. Those from Mecklenburg, Brunswick, Brandenburg and the cities of Lower Saxony are decidedly, one might almost say, unqualifiedly favorable. The same may be said of that of Lübeck, Hamburg and Lüneburg, and of that from Würtemberg, Baden and Henneberg. That from Prussia approves the Torgau Book in its general content; it only requires that it proceed further in the same direction. Taken as a whole, and as representing the Lutheran churches of Germany it can be affirmed that these censures are more favorable than unfavorable toward the Torgau Book. They show that the professed adherents of the Augsburg Confession are loyal to the Lutheran doctrine, and that the majority are practically unanimous in their approval of that explanation and formulation of the same that appears in the Torgau Book.

But those churches which spoke with opposition—some of them with uncertainty, some with ambiguity—did not regard themselves, neither were they regarded by their contemporaries, as un-Lutheran. They knew, and their contemporaries knew, that they confessed themselves to the Lutheran doctrine as that doctrine had been exhibited in their own *Corpora Doctrinae*, which, without a single exception, contained the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, and the most of them also one or both of Luther's catechisms, and some of them also the Schmalkald Articles. It is conceded, without hesitation, that the Anhalt censure, through the influence of Wolfgang Amling, exhibits a one-sided Melanchthonistic spirit: yet two countervailing facts must be reckoned

* Anton, p. 194; Döllinger, *Reformation*, III., 472.

with, namely (a) that the Anhalt censure declares the willingness of its authors to add to the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* the Catechisms and the Schmalkald Articles, or the public writings of Luther;* (b) that when in the latter part of March, 1577, Jacob Andreae held a private interview, three hours in length, with Amling and Abraham Ulrich, Superintendent, at Zerbst, he reported as a result that the theologians had declared that when he read their censure he would find that there was not much difference between them, and that they would not act stubbornly nor stand in the way of Christian unity.†

The theologians of Pomerania and those of Holstein had also expressed their preference for the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum,* but these censures themselves are witnesses against a one-sided Melanchthonism, as are also others yet to be quoted. And he would be regarded as a calumniator who should say that Superintendent Jacob Rung, the author of the Pomeranian censure, and Superintendent Paul von Eitzen, the author of the Holstein censure, were holding up the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* as a mask under which they meant to conceal Calvinism, or Crypto-Calvinism, in any of their forms.

The most embarrassing circumstance for the authors of the Torgau Book was the fact that so many of the adverse censures, as those from Pomerania, Holstein, Ansbach, Nürnberg, came from churches and places on which not even the shadow of suspicion rested. Most of them had indicated their Lutheran orthodoxy by the incorporation of Luther's public writings in their standards of doctrine. The chief grounds of objection were the mistreatment of Melanchthon, the doctrine of ubiquity, and the exaltation of Luther's private—most significantly—his controversial writings, to the position of normative authority for doctrine—a procedure utterly contrary to Luther's own fundamental principle that only the Word of God should determine what should be taught and believed in the Church, and who had expressed the wish that his own books might be consigned to oblivion, and that Melanchthon's books, especially the *Loci Communes,* might live and instruct the theologians and pastors.‡

* Planck, VI., p. 512.

† *Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie,* 1867, p. 27, article by Pressel, drawn from archival sources, entitled: *Churfürst Ludwig von der Pfalz und die Konkordienformel.*

‡ See the Preface to Luther's *Opera,* Jena Edition, vol. I., dated March 5, 1545. That Luther knew of and commended the *Loci* of 1535 and of 1543-4, is as historically certain as it is historically certain that he wrote and subscribed this Preface. In the year 1540 he said to a group of students

at his own table, in the presence of Dr. George Major, then Rector of the University: "Read Philip's *Loci Communes* next to the Bible." So testifies Mathesius in his *Leben Dr. Martin Luthers, Die Zwölfte Predigt,* who was present and heard it. The entire Wittenberg Theological Faculty, whose head at that time was Melanchthon, testified in 1559: "The volume of the *Loci Communes* published the year immediately preceding his death, Luther, in a public declaration, expressly commended to the Church, so that beyond all doubt he witnessed that his own views agree with that doctrine which is embraced and expressed in the Augsburg Confession and in the *Loci Communes.*" *Expositio Eorum, Quae Theologi Academiae Wittebergensis,* etc. (published at Wittenberg, 1559), p. Sss. 3. In 1570 the theologians of Leipzig and Wittenberg and the Superintendents of Electoral Saxony, after describing the edition published "three years before Luther's death," say: "We know and can prove by those who were much and often with Luther that he held and esteemed this book so highly, that he constantly kept it by him, and maintained that such an excellent book had not been written since the days of the Apostles, and said that he would rather suffer his books to be destroyed than that this book of Philip's should be removed from the Church and be lost." *Endlicher Bericht,* fols. 17, 18. Hence very properly has Credner said that "Luther took no offense at Melanchthon's changes in the *Loci Communes,* though he compared this book to the Holy Scriptures. And when, at the close of his life, he awarded it the 'superiority' to other books, and the question is asked: To which of the various editions we are able to accept as Luther's sure answer to this question: To all. For in all the Scripture-principle and the doctrine of Justification by Faith are correctly taught and guarded." *Exörterungen Kirchlicher Zeitfragen,* p. 110. Frankfort am Main, 1846.

In the year 1588, Christian I., Elector of Saxony, "willed and ordered that Melanchthon's *Loci Communes,* a book of which Dr. Luther had testified that it is a work of such excellence that hitherto not much like it had been written in theology, shall be diligently read by the students according to the way in which the author understood it and has explained in his other books." Förstemann, *Liber Decanorum,* p. 165. This document is copied by Förstemann *ex autographo Decanorum.* No one could presume that the Elector and his counsellors had reference to other than current editions, or that the Elector would confine Luther's testimony to the first edition.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE BERGIC BOOK.

It will be recalled that some of the censures complain of the prolixity of the Torgau Book. This is especially the case with the censure of the theologians of Landgrave William of Hesse.

1. *The Epitome.*

To meet this objection and to conciliate the Hessians, Andreae, with the approbation of the Elector of Saxony, undertook the preparation of an epitome of the Torgau Book. In this epitome he accurately reproduces the substance of the original. First, in the case of each article he makes *A Statement of the Controversy* involved. Then, in a series of positive affirmations, he presents the orthodox doctrine of the Article, and in a series of negative statements he rejects and condemns the doctrines that stand in contradiction to the doctrine affirmed. In the Article *On the Person of Christ* he has greatly increased the negatives, both in number and in extent; and to the Article as a whole he imparted a decidedly ubiquitarian expression. To the epitome as a whole he gave the name: *Summarischer Begriff der Streitigen Artikel zwischen den Theologen Augsburgischer Confession in nachfolgender Widerholung nach Anleitung Gottes Worts christlich erkläret und vergleichen;* that is: *A Summary Statement of the Articles Controverted among the Theologians of the Augsburg Confession, Explained and Adjusted in a Christian Manner according to the Direction of the Word of God.*

This Epitome was sent to Landgrave William, February 9, 1577, followed by a letter from Jacob Andreae, dated February 13, 1577. The letter informs the Landgrave of the progress that had been made in the work of concord, in that all the theologians of all the Princes, with only a few exceptions, have accepted the Torgau Book in essentials. The hope is expressed that the orthodox theologians will find much less to dispute about in the Epitome than they had found in the Torgau Book. Then the declaration is made that the devil, with whom they have to do, is not the devil of flesh and blood, nor the devil of the sacramentarians,

but a worse devil, such as Luther had spoken of in some of his books, the devil who would treat the person of Christ as he is treated in the Turkish Alcoran, as recently he had observed is done by the professors of theology in Leipzig, Jena and Wittenberg.*

From this letter the Landgrave learned for the first time that the Torgau Book was to be revised with reference to the censures of the theologians and was meant to be officially sanctioned. But on reading the Epitome he discovered that it contained in substance the very doctrines to which his theologians had objected, while Andreae's arrogance and his wanton attack on the theologians of the three universities filled him with bitter wrath and indignation, and increased his opposition to the Torgau Book.

2. *The First Revision.*

As early as January 17, 1577, Andreae proposed to the Elector of Saxony that, so soon as the other censures come in, a commission of three orthodox theologians be appointed to examine the censures and to determine the form of the Torgau Book. "In this way," he thought, "preparation could be made for holding a general convention, and that not only would time be gained and expenses reduced, but also that a better and surer understanding among the theologians would follow, when the representatives and theologians of each principality shall see that the censure of no Prince or theologian has been overlooked." †

In a letter dated February 7th, Andreae proposed to the Elector that Selneccer, Chemnitz and he himself should meet at a suitable place for the purpose of taking in hand all the censures and opinions on the Torgau Book, and of reading and considering them carefully, and of introducing into the Torgau Book, written on the opposite page, all that might be deemed necessary and profitable. In a postscript he suggested the cloister of Bergen, near Magdeburg, as the place of meeting, as that is about equidistant from the three proposed commissioners, and is a free cloister, whose abbot is interested in the work of pacification and will welcome the commissioners as guests.‡

Andreae's proposition was approved by the Elector, who, the following day, wrote to Chemnitz, inviting him to join Andreae and Selneccer in weighing the censures and in introducing into

* Heppe, III., 156 *et seqq.* Andreae's letter in Heppe, III., 399 *et seqq.*

† Pressel in *Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*, 1867, p. 18.

‡ Planck, VI., 535. Pressel, *ut supra*, pp. 18, 19.

the Formula whatever they consider profitable and necessary.*

Chemnitz accepted the invitation, and March 1, 1577, by order of the Elector and with the approval of the Administrator, the three theologians named met in a room over the chapel of the cloister of Bergen. The triumvirate, as these three men have been very generally called, carefully examined the censures and weighed the *desiderata* of all. The work went forward so rapidly that, March 14th, they made and signed their report to the Elector. They begin by saying that after carefully reading the censures that had been sent in they find that all the Princes and theologians, except those of Holstein and Anhalt, were pleased with the Torgau Book, and were favorable to the work of concord. They express their gratification with the discovery that all the censures, except those from Anhalt and Holstein, agree on the Holy Scriptures, the three ancient creeds, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther, "as the basis and explanation of our Christian faith and Confession." They meet the wish of the Ansbach theologians for a better arrangement of the Articles by saying that they had thought it expedient to follow the Augsburg Confession. They reply to the criticism that the Torgau Book is too prolix by pointing to the Epitome that had been already made. To the objection of some, that the language employed was too strong, they oppose the objection of others—Hamburg, Lübeck and Lüneburg—that the language employed was too mild. They decided that inasmuch as objections had been made to the phrase, *corpus doctrinae*, it would be advisable to drop it, and to substitute another phrase for it, and to entitle their work: Von dem Summarischen Begriff, Grund-Regel und Richtschnur, nach welcher alle Lehr geurtheileto, und die eingefallenen Irrungen Christlich erkläret und entscheiden werden ; that is, *Of a Comprehensive Summary, Basis, Rule and Canon according to which all Doctrines are to be Judged, and the Differences that have arisen are to be Explained and Decided.* They defend their action in prefixing the word "unaltered" to the Augsburg Confession by declaring that in this way they can best meet the calumnies of the Papists and the conduct of the Sacramentarians. They deem it advisable to omit the names of Melanchthon and Brentz, and to submit their books to the judgment of the Church according to the foregoing rule and canon. Because the churches in many places have been confused by errors, and for the purpose of

* The Elector's letter in Rehtmeyer, III., Beylage, p. 283.

guarding the young, they unanimously recommend that books containing false doctrines, and their authors, shall be condemned, and that a clause shall be supplied which shall condemn all persons who may write anything in opposition to the Torgau Book; and since there are different opinions in regard to the books of Melanchthon, and since they contain errors on Free-will, on the Lord's Supper, on the *Communicatio Idiomatum,* they declare that "an unavoidable necessity requires that a proper admonition be made in this Explanation (the Torgau Book) in regard to the aforenamed books of Philip," that is, the *Loci Communes,* the *Examen Ordinandorum* and the letter to the Elector of the Palatinate on the Lord's Supper. In regard to subscription to this improved formula, they insist that "necessity will require that a common, uniform, clearly defined formula shall be composed, so that no false teacher can hide himself, and then everyone shall simply subscribe his name and surname and that of the church which at the time he serves. This formula is to be composed in a synod yet to be held, and thereafter this explanation is to be subscribed and used in the consistory of every place, and in the future no one is to be admitted to the ministry who has not previously been examined on these articles as propriety and necessity require. Then, after he has properly declared himself, he is to subscribe the said formula with his own hands." Visitations and examinations are to be instituted for the purpose of preventing the recurrence of error. "It is also highly necessary that a proper and strict oversight of the press be maintained, in order that not all kinds of books be printed without distinction, though useful books are not to be proscribed." The difference of view in regard to exorcism, "which is not of the essence of Baptism, and by which the devil is not driven out of the child," may be treated at the proposed synod. In regard to the proposed synod they are of the opinion that, in addition to Electors and Princes, there should be representatives of the counts and of the cities of Saxony and Upper Germany, so that there may be greater confidence among the ministers, and so that concord may be promoted. They say that they have examined the Epitome and find that it contains in summary all that is found in the Torgau Book itself. Finally they express the judgment that it is unnecessary for the censures to make intercession for "the poor exiles," since at Torgau, in the year 1576, the Elector had declared himself gracious.*

* The Report is given in full by Hutter, Cap. XIII. Summary by Planck, VI., 537, and by Pressel, *ut supra,* pp. 19 *et seqq.*

This report, signed Jacobus Andreae, D. Martinus Chemnitius, D. Nicolaus Selneccerus D., so pleased the Elector of Saxony that he immediately dispatched one of his privy counsellors, Dr. David Pfeiffer, to the Elector of Brandenburg with a message of the following import: That all the articles of the Torgau Book have been approved by nearly all of the most distinguished Princes; that it is now hoped that all disputes will be avoided; that, in order to promote this important work, the Elector of Saxony does not hesitate to inform Brandenburg how matters have gone in Saxony, and to propose to the Elector of Brandenburg that all parties should meet at Magdeburg, June 25th.*

August had also instructed Dr. Pfeiffer to agree with the Elector of Brandenburg on a letter which, in the name of the Electors, respectively, of Saxony, Brandenburg and the Palatinate, should invite the other Princes of the Augsburg Confession to the proposed convention. The Elector of Brandenburg was in general well pleased with the proposition of the Elector of Saxony, and declared himself ready to join in sending to the Elector of the Palatinate and in inviting him to take part in the work, though he did not think that the synod should be called before October 6th, and he suggested that meanwhile the theologians at Dresden should bring the censures into a correct *Corpus* and should send it to the different Estates. In this way the mind of the theologians could be better ascertained, since there was danger of increasing the distraction. After some hesitation and vacillation it was decided at Dresden, partly because of the hostile attitude of the Prince of Anhalt, and partly because of the arrival of additional censures, to pursue a different course.†

3. *The Second Revision.*

At the suggestion of Andreae, doubtless, the Elector of Saxony proposed to the Elector of Brandenburg, April 1st, to send two of his theologians, who, with Andreae, Chemnitz, Selneccer and Chytraeus, should make a new revision of the Torgau Book in view of the censures that had been sent in. This pleased the Elector of Brandenburg, who appointed Andrew Musculus and Christopher Koerner, who had helped to compose the Torgau Book, to take part in this second revision. From this time on Andreae thought no more about a great convention of theolog-

* Pressel, p. 23.
† Planck, VI., 545; Pressel, p. 25; Kolde, *Einleitung*, p. lxxii.

ians, but at most only of a convention of Princes, which should sanction the conclusions reached by the theologians. He has indeed grown very confident of the success of the work of concord, for, May 4th, he wrote to Marbach: "Luther, who died and was buried at Wittenberg, is, as you see, risen from the dead: at least he has already raised his head from the grave. The body will soon follow. The work of concord is making excellent progress."

April 27th the Elector of Saxony invited the six theologians named above to meet at Bergen, May 19th, and requested the abbot to receive and entertain them, supposing that the conference would not last more than three days. The six came together at the time appointed and began their work by carefully examining the censures. Much attention was given to the *desiderata* of Würtemberg, Baden and Henneberg. All questions were decided by the vote of the majority, though Andreae had his own way in almost everything. He and Chemnitz came into such violent collision with each other over some points "that the sparks flew." Chytraeus opposed all changes made in the Torgau Book, especially the reception of so many citations from Luther's writings on the corporeal presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and the changes made in the Article on Free-will. But he was in the minority, and in excited mood he left the cloister and disavowed participation in the composition of the new formula. In the year 1581 he declared that the changes made in the Torgau Book were made by the triumvirs in his absence, that is, before he came to Bergen, and he expressed regret that the Torgau Book had not been allowed to remain in the form in which it had been composed and sent to the Churches of the Augsburg Confession.*

However, notwithstanding the want of harmony in the committee of six, the work of revising the Torgau Book the second time was completed, and a report to the Elector was signed by the six, May 28, 1577. In this report they say that they have carefully read the censures of the Torgau Book, and have prepared one volume, which they believe will be accepted by all pious teachers of the pure doctrine: that they have carefully examined the Epitome, and have decided that it shall be placed before the larger work: that they would be pleased to have a

* Epistolae, p. 109. The other facts presented in this paragraph are taken from Anton, pp. 196-7; Planck, VI., 546; Heppe, III., 205-6; Pressel, *ut supra*, pp. 26, 30; Schütz, *Vita Chytraei, passim;* Balthaser, *Historie Torgischen Buchs, passim.*

synod of all the clergy of the Augsburg Confession, but there is danger that greater schisms would follow, for they have ascertained that "in very many places there are ministers of the churches who would show themselves absolutely wayward and obstinate in regard to doctrine, and we also greatly suspect that there are some Princes in the same countries who are inoculated with like opinions and prejudices." They therefore give it as their "opinion that it would be altogether safer, and without any danger, if subscription to the Christian Concord be first required (exigatur), in writing or by letters, from some of the Estates of the Augsburg Confession. The execution of this our plan can be instituted in the following manner:

"First, that this subscription be required before all (ante omnes exigatur) from the theologians within those Estates which from their censures are known to be in favor of the purer doctrine, and whose subscription would undoubtedly ensue at once. Such are especially those of your two Highnesses (the Elector of Saxony and the Elector of Brandenburg); and also now by the grace of God the theologians of the Most Illustrious Elector Ludwig of the Palatinate, through whom he has in a Christian manner restored the consistories of his Highness and the churches in the entire Palatinate. Then from those in Lower Saxony, and in the Mecklenburg, Lüneburg and Brunswick dominions; then in Grubenhagen, in the maritime part of Saxony and in the cities adjacent thereto, except Bremen alone. Then from those who are in Franconia of Upper Germany and in Swabia. Then in the Margravate of George Frederick of Naumbach. Then in the dominions of Count Palatine Philip Ludwig, of Count Palatine John, of the Duke of Würtemberg and the Margrave of Baden. Then from the Free Cities of Upper Germany, such as Ratisbon, Augsburg, Ulm, of whose theologians (Nürnberg excepted) and their subscriptions there can be no doubt.

"When indeed such subscriptions shall have been obtained from the above-named Most Illustrious Electors and Princes, and from some of the Free Cities, it can then be required for these very reasons from the remaining Estates of the Empire. If at the present a sufficient time be allowed them for deliberation they will themselves think seriously about embracing this Christian movement. For when by means of this subscription they shall have learned of the unanimous consensus of those three Most Illustrious Electors and Princes, the reasons by which they have seemed hitherto restrained and hindered, will have been

refuted. By the assistance of divine grace it will be brought about that the same subscription will be obtained from them.

"But lest in such subscriptions there be some difference under which false, restless and obstinate doctors may hide themselves, this admonition must not be overlooked in the letter that is sent out for obtaining this subscription, namely, that all the theologians shall be on their guard that no one in subscribing shall of his own accord employ long sentences which may contain some special explanation; but let them write only the bare name, together with the surname and the designation of the place (whether church or school) which they serve.

"And since our opponents, the Papists, both within and without the German Empire, make the charge that scarcely two preachers can be found in our churches who hold alike in all the Articles of the Augsburg Confession, it is our judgment in this matter that in obtaining the subscriptions the following order be observed: Let the doctors of theology, who in the universities belong to the consistories, subscribe first, in order that it may be certain as to their character, and that through them false teachers may not at any time be introduced, nor received in the schools, nor unorthodox pastors in the churches.

"Then in each city the pastor with his chaplains or vicars (where such are wanting, the Superintendent with two rural preachers) not only in his own name, but also in that of the other pastors, chaplains and teachers who belong to the same diocese (provided they shall have first obtained from such the permission and authority to subscribe), shall subscribe in about the following manner: 'I, John N., Pastor and Superintendent, with N. and together with this N. also Pastor N. with N. and N. N., Pastors in conjunction with that N. N., subscribe both for ourselves and for N., Pastor, Chaplain and Teacher, whose names are as follows.'

"In regard to those Evangelical Princes who have not yet declared whether they favor the work of concord or not, they should be heard as to their doubts and objections, so that they may be answered and then invited to subscribe. If they still refuse, it will not be necessary to have anything more to do with them. Care must be taken that no one hereafter be allowed to start new controversies, either in the churches or in the schools. The churches are to be warned against the Crypto-Calvanistic literature that had been circulated in Saxony and elsewhere, and a censorship of the press is recommended. In the matter of exe-

cuting the plan of union they refer to what they had proposed in the preceding March, 'when the Torgau Formula or Corpus Doctrinae was amended.'

"Done at Bergen near Magdeburg 28th May &c. 1597." *

The name which they gave to the second part of the work, the *Solida Declaratio,* is: Gründliche [originally "Allgemeine"] †, lautere, richtige und endliche Wiederholung und Erklärung etlicher Artikel Augsburgischer Confession, in welchen eine zeit lang unter etlichen Theologen derselbigen zugethan, Streit vorgefallen, nach Anleitung Gottes Worts und summarischem Inhalt unserer christlichen Lehr beigelegt und verglichen; that is, "A Solid, Clear, Correct and Final Repetition and Explanation of Some Articles of the Augsburg Confession, in regard to which a Controversy, that has for some time Existed among the Theologians of the Augsburg Confession, is Settled and Adjusted according to the Direction of God's Word and a Compendious Statement of our Christian Doctrine."

This is the Bergic Book, which is generally known as *The Formula of Concord,* called in German: *Die Konkordienformel.*

4. *The Changes Made in the Torgau Book.*

The censures of the Torgau Book revealed perhaps more clearly than had been previously known the existence of three parties in the Lutheran Church in Germany. There were the Lutheran zealots, commonly spoken of as the Ultras, the extremists, the gnesio-Lutherans. These identified Luther's doctrine with Christianity, and Luther's spirit with the Spirit of Christ.‡ These Flacianists, as they are also called, had joined hands with the

* The full text of this Report is given in Latin by Hospinian, fol. 111 *et seqq.;* in extracts and summaries by Anton, p. 207 *et seqq.;* Planck, VI., 548 *et seqq.;* Heppe, III., 208 *et seqq.;* Pressel, *ut supra,* pp. 30 *et seqq.* Some historians are inclined to believe that a conference for further revision of the Torgau Book was held at Bergen sometime between the March and the May conferences, attended only by the first triumvirate. See Anton, pp. 201-202; Planck, VI., 544 *et seqq.;* Heppe, III., 205. These authors have probably construed Andreae's visit to Bergen, in one of his journeys, the last of March, as evidence that a conference of revision was held at that time. But, as Pressel says, "this had nothing whatever to do with a revision of the Torgau Book." *Ut supra,* p. 28, *note* 15. The Report of the May Conference refers to the March Conference, and to no other, and we have only the two reports. Chytraeus mentions a conference in March and one in June, though he evidently has reference to the May Conference. *Epistolae,* p. 418. Recent writers, Seeberg, *Realencyclopädie,*[3] vol. 10, p. 742, and Kolde, *Einleitung,* p. lxxii., make no reference to a third conference. Our own investigation leads us to conclude that there were only two conferences of revision at Bergen.

† See Anton, p. 211.

‡ Compare Andreae's letter to Heshuss.

Swabians in the doctrine of the Person of Christ and in that of the Lord's Supper. This party was, in the main, absolutely uncompromising. It now had its culminating expression in the Prussian Censure, and to a large extent also in the Würtemberg-Baden-Henneberg Censure.

Then there was the moderate party, soundly Lutheran, even in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but with a grateful regard for the authority of Melanchthon. Chemnitz, Selneccer, the Rostock Theological Faculty, and the leading theologians and Church officials of Holstein and Pomerania, belonged to this party, and had not—to speak generically—shown an active hand in the controversies between the Flacianists and the Philippists. Thirdly, there were the Philippists of Electoral Saxony and of other sections of Germany, who, in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, were Calvinists, rather than Lutherans.

These parties were separated from each other by distrust and hostility. The Flacianists had but little confidence in the moderate party, and the third party was repudiated by both the others. The effort made at Zerbst, in the year 1570, to reconcile all these parties, had signally failed. The Torgau Book was constructed mainly, if not entirely, with reference to the Extremists and the Moderates, though it represented essentially the position of the moderate party. It is not probable that the Philippists were taken into the account in the construction and explanation of the articles, that is, in the positive and didactic statements. If the other two parties could be reconciled, the Philippists might be brought under subjection by the method subsequently proposed for taking the subscriptions, or they might be entirely ignored.

The censures pointed out the direction that the work of concord must take if it was to end in success. The Flacianists could not be induced to come to the position of the Moderates, the position, essentially, of Chemnitz, Selneccer and Chytraeus. The Moderates might be induced to approximate the position of the Extremists and to sacrifice Melanchthon. The Flacianists and their allies, the Swabians, Brandenburgers and others, were probably more numerous, and certainly more influential, than the Moderates. It is easy to comprehend the psychology of the situation, and to understand the thoughts, feelings and motives that prevailed at Bergen, especially when we know that by this time Jacob Andreae had become very dictatorial, and that Musculus and Koerner had become essentially Flacianists. The pre-

ponderance of votes at Bergen would necessarily favor the rigid party. Hence we do not find it difficult to forecast the nature of the changes that shall be introduced into the Torgau Book under the influence of the censures. Our difficulty arises from the fact that so late as the preceding June these six Bergic Fathers had declared of the Torgau Book under their own signatures that "this present explanation of the controverted articles, and no other, is our faith, doctrine and confession, in which, by God's grace and with undismayed heart, we will stand before the judgment throne of Christ and render an account." *

But did the Bergic Fathers, as Selneccer himself calls them, introduce material changes into the Torgau Book at Bergen? Let us hear the testimony of the Fathers themselves, and learn the opinions of historians amply qualified to judge in the premises:

1. Selneccer says that "the six theologians were brought to Bergen for the purpose of reading the opinions, and that their instruction was only to acquaint themselves with the censures, and to change nothing in sense, since in that they were perfectly agreed, though they sometimes added little words and useful suggestions." †

Chemnitz wrote: "At Bergen the Torgau Book was merely illustrated and improved. The substance of doctrine remained unchanged." ‡

Chytraeus writes in May, 1581: "In many respects I also prefer the Torgau Book to the Bergic. It was first changed by the triumvirate, Jacob, Selneccer and Chemnitz, in the month of March, when I was not present. Afterwards, in the month of June [he means May], we other three were also called *pro forma* when everything had been already transacted. Yet, what I have once signed I neither may nor will retract." § And in 1591 he wrote: "Of all that was said, done or written by me, not one thing was approved by Jacob Andreae, our Aristarchus. Thus not a word written by me is found in the Book of Concord. Hence I cannot justly be counted among the authors of it, but among the subscribers. Yet what I have once subscribed I have never retracted." ||

Also in the year 1582 Chytraeus wrote: "In the explication

* Semler, *Torgauisches Buch,* p. 322.
† *Recitationes,* p. 63.
‡ Quoted from Planck, VI., 547, note 25.
§ *Epistolae,* p. 418.
|| *Epistolae,* p. 873.

of the controversies I desired that in many parts the Torgau Formula be retained, rather than that it be changed at Bergen." And also in the same epistle: "Oh, that this arena for speciously declaiming against ubiquity had not been opened to the adversaries by inserting into the Book of Concord certain passages from Luther! These, you yourself remember, did not exist in the Torgau original." *

Otto Frid. Schütz writes: "Not in little words only was the Torgau Book changed. But entire sentences and clauses were now inserted and now removed, as seemed good to the theologians." †

J. G. Walch writes: "It cannot be denied that not only words and phrases, but also entire sentences were now added and now taken away." ‡

Rehtmeyer: "But in the Book composed by them at Torgau they had to make decided changes by subtracting and by adding after that they had been reminded of this and of that by the censures." §

2. A comparison of the Formula of Concord with the Torgau Book proves beyond all question that the changes introduced into the Formula at Bergen are *material,* and that they do materially affect the doctrine, especially in the Article on Free-will, and in that on the Lord's Supper. In *The Swabian-Saxon Concordia,* which in its final form, be it remembered, is almost entirely the work of Chemnitz and Chytraeus, it is said: "We must remember here that God works upon the understanding and will of man whom he converts in no sense as upon a stone or a block (which knows, feels and wills nothing about it), nor does he utterly destroy the substance and essence of body, soul and heart of the old man." (Pfaff, p. 497.) This is retained word for word in the Torgau Book (Semler, p. 79), and it is further affirmed that "the will of man is not entirely like a stone and a block." (Pfaff, p. 498.) In the Bergic Book this is changed, both in form and in essence, since it is declared that "conversion to God is the work of the Holy Spirit alone, who is the true author and who alone works this in us. . . . The understanding and the will of the unregenerate are nothing else

* *Epistolae,* pp. 1198, 1199. This letter was written to the Helmstädt theologians, Tilemann Heshuss and Daniel Hofmann.

† *Vita D. Chytraei,* p. 418.

‡ *Introductio,* p. 720.

§ *Braunschweig Kirchen-Historie,* III., 456. See, to the same effect, Planck, VI., 547; Arnold, *Unparteyische Kirchen-Historie,* II., XVI., Cap. 18, § 17; Balthaser, I., 24; Gieseler, IV., 486, note 24.

than the *subjectum convertendum.* . . . In this conversion the will of man, the subject of conversion, does nothing but merely suffers God to operate in it until it is regenerated." "As already declared, man in his conversion does absolutely nothing, and in this case he is much worse than a stone and a block; for he resists the Word and Will of God, until God wakes him from the dead, illumines and renews him" (Müller, p. 602).

In the *Swabian-Saxon Concordia,* and in the Torgau Book, the Melanchthonian formulae: "In conversion the will of man is not inactive, but does something; likewise God draws, but draws him who is willing,"* are explained as follows: "This is not to be understood of the natural unconverted will of man, as if the will of man before his conversion has of itself so much power that before the *beginning* of his conversion it can coöperate, for it is dead unto the good; but of the will which the Holy Spirit through the Word has *begun* to convert and to renew." (Heppe, p. 67; italics ours). In the Bergic Book the first of these formulae given above is called a scholastic and papistical statement; and of the two together and of Basil's *dictum: "tantum velis et Deus praeoccurit,"* it is declared: "Since such expressions are introduced contrary to the doctrine of the grace of God, for the confirmation of the false opinion respecting the powers of man's Free-will in his conversion, it is manifest from the foregoing explanation, that they are not in harmony with sound doctrine, but are opposed to it; consequently they are properly to be avoided when we treat of conversion to God.

"For the conversion of our depraved will to God (which, indeed, is nothing else than the resurrection of the same from spiritual death) is absolutely the work of God alone, as also the resuscitation in the bodily resurrection of the flesh must be attributed to God alone, as already it has been clearly explained and has been proved by sure testimonies of the Holy Scripture" (Müller, pp. 608-9). Here there is not only difference, but direct contradiction between the Torgau Book and the Bergic Book. Besides, there is nothing whatever in the Torgau Book to correspond to the last paragraph quoted from the Bergic Book, nor to the one following it in the Bergic Book.†

In the *Swabian-Saxon Concordia* (Pfaff, 498-9, and in the Torgau Book (Semler, p. 81) it is said: "This explanation shows plainly enough that also in conversion there is a very

* Heppe, *Text der Bergischen Concordienformel,* p. 67; Semler, 96-7.
† Heppe, *ut supra,* p. 67; Semler, p. 97.

great difference between the will of man and a stone or a block.''* This does not appear in the Bergic Book. Also in *The Swabian-Saxon Concordia* it is distinctly said that in conversion man ''gives consent'' (Jawort) to the preached Word (Pfaff, p. 496). In the Torgau Book the doctrine of the three causes of conversion is retained. But they must be rightly and properly explained (Heppe, p. 68). In the Bergic Book it is declared that ''in conversion man does nothing, works nothing, but only suffers,'' and in regard to the three causes operating in conversion, it is said: ''Also, since the youth have been greatly disturbed in the schools about the three causes concurring in the conversion of a regenerate person, and since it has been a matter of dispute as to how these (namely, the Word preached and heard, the Holy Spirit and the will of man) concur, we wish it to be repeated, in accordance with the explanation given above, that conversion to God is the work of the Holy Spirit alone, who alone is that splendid workman who effects those things in us. Nevertheless, he uses the preaching and the hearing of his Holy Word as his ordinary and legitimate instrument. But the understanding and will of the man not yet regenerated are only subjectum convertendum, for they are the understanding and will of man spiritually dead, in which man the Holy Spirit works conversion and regeneration. To this work of converting man the will contributes nothing, but suffers God to work in it until it is regenerated'' (Müller, p. 610). In the Torgau Book it is said that there can be no conversion where ''the person does not wholly believe the promise and does not accommodate himself to grace'' (Semler, p. 94; Heppe, p. 65). This is exchanged for: ''Is not made susceptible to grace by God'' (Müller, p. 608). In the Torgau Book the passage: ''Conversion is such a change in the understanding, will and heart of man by the operation of the Holy Spirit that the man wills and can assent to and believe the Word, follow the Holy Spirit, hold, apply and accommodate himself to grace'' (Semler, p. 94; Heppe, p. 65), is exchanged for: ''Conversion is such a change in the understanding, will and heart of man by the operation of the Holy Spirit, that the man through such operation of the Holy Spirit can accept the proffered grace'' (Müller, p. 608).

These comparisons of related passages, taken from the two books, prove beyond all question that the Bergic Fathers in transforming the one book into the other did make such changes

* Heppe, *ut supra*, p. 58.

in the Article of Free-will as do materially affect the doctrine. But if the reader will follow the two texts as exhibited by Heppe in his *Der Text der Bergischen Concordienformel* (pp. 28-76) with diplomatic accuracy, he will discover that the Article on Free-will in the Torgau Book was to a large extent rewritten for the Bergic Book, and that the standpoint of the article, and its meaning, in more places than our comparisons show, were changed. Hence, should we confine ourselves to this one article, we would have before us documentary refutation of the statements made by Selneccer and Chemnitz, that the Torgau Book was changed at Bergen only in the addition of "little words and useful suggestions," and in matters of illustration.*

And when we turn to other articles we find that significant changes were made. We have already quoted from Chytraeus in regard to the introduction of passages into the Bergic Book from Luther's writings, which gave occasion for disputes in regard to the doctrine of ubiquity. The Swabian doctrine of ubiquity is brought out very distinctly in the Epitome, wherein it is declared that Christ as man is present to all creatures; and though the Epitome was primarily the work of Andreae, yet it was sanctioned at Bergen and declared to be in accord with the fuller declaration, that is, in reality, it exhibits the meaning of the Bergic Book. Now, turning to Heppe's texts, we find that in this Article VIII. not a little has been stricken out of the Torgau Book; and that not a little has been introduced into the Bergic Book, which is not in the Torgau Book, as, for instance, the two quotations from the *Greater Confession on the Lord's Supper*, and in the two from *The Councils of the Church* (Müller, 862-864). Also the larger part of the quotation (Müller, 692-693) from the *Greater Confession*, is an addition.

Chytraeus also tells us that many things were inserted in the Bergic Book from the writings of Luther, "both in regard to the fundamental basis of the presence and in regard to the diverse modes of the bodily presence." † It is probable that this allegation has reference, in part, to the additions made to Article VIII.; nevertheless, important changes were made in Arti-

* Taken as a whole, the Bergic Book is slightly shorter than the Torgau Book. Not a little was dropped from Article II., near the beginning; and Article IX.: *The Descensus ad Inferos* is probably not one-tenth as long in the Bergic Book as it was in the Torgau Book. Semler, p. 261; Heppe, p. 178.

† *Epistolae*, p. 109.

cle VII., so that the Nürnbergers, who cannot be suspected of Crypto-Calvinism in any sense, declared to the Elector of Saxony: "In the Article of the Supper those things which had been well determined in the Torgau Formula are corrupted in the Bergic Concordia." *

In the other articles changes were made, not all of which are insignificant and limited to a few little words or to the matter of illustration, though they are formal rather than material. It is the changes made in Articles II., VII. and VIII., essentially in conformity to the Prussian censure, that have determined the character of the Formula of Concord in its doctrinal qualities; that made it *Lutherish*,† rather than Lutheran; that have shaped the course of its adherents and subscribers in the direction of Lutherism, rather than given them the broader conception of Lutheranism.

That the question of Free-will was settled essentially in the sense of Flacius is conceded by the most competent Lutheran scholars of a former generation.‡ Equally candid are scholars of the present generation. Kawerau, after giving a brief account of the composition of the Torgau Book and of its transmission to the Estates for their censures, says: "With these censures in view, there now followed in the cloister of Bergen near Magdeburg (March to May, 1577) the final revision by Andreae, Chemnitz and Selneccer, with whom also were associated Chytraeus, Koerner and Musculus: The *Bergic Book*. This is the Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord. At the same time the theologians also revised the brief abstract (the Epitome) that had in the meantime been prepared by Andreae, and approved it. The Bergic Book eliminated still more decidedly [than the Torgau Book] the traces of the Melanchthonian teaching, which still remained in the Swabian-Saxon Concordia, yea, even in the Torgau Book, as a reminder of the fact that Chemnitz, Selneccer and Chytraeus had proceeded from the school of Melanchthon. They had also nearly admitted synergistic views, and at least Selneccer and Chemnitz represented that mediating view on Ubiquity. But the result of the continuous development on the dogmatic course marked out under the essential coöperation of Melanchthon gave the preponderance to the rigid

* Hospinian, Cap. XV. See, on the same page, the reasons given why the Nürnbergers cannot approve the Bergic Book.

† The Germans, in speaking, make a nice distinction by accent: *Lútherisch* is *Lutherish; Luthérisch* is *Lutheran.*

‡ *The Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1905, p. 187, *note.*

Luther conception, though, undoubtedly, Ubiquity was not expressed in the absolute sense of the Würtembergers.'' *

And to the same effect also Dr. Karl Müller: ''August called Andreae, Chemnitz and Selneccer, also Chytraeus, and the Brandenburg theologians, Musculus and Koerner, to a second conference in the cloister of Bergen (March and May, 1577), to consider the censures that had come in, and thereupon to revise the Concordia. The result was the *Bergic Book.* Externally it consists of two parts, that is, of a second, though somewhat reduced, revision of the Torgau Book and of a brief abstract from it. But in its inner content it presents a manifestly farther advance in the direction of the rigid Lutheranism. In the elimination of the Philippistic elements and in opposition to Melanchthon, under the direction of Andreae, a still further significant step was taken. Only in the positive rejection of Melanchthon's writings and in the demand for recantation on the part of the former Philippists, nobody's wishes were gratified in regard to such matters. In reference to the Corpus Doctrinae and his older compositions the censures, with the exception of those of the real Philippists, had shown an almost complete agreement. Consequently, the writings which had been continuously proposed in the last transactions were received into the final plan, and to these was added the Bergic Book.'' † Loofs expresses himself in about the same way, namely, that the first and second articles of the Formula of Concord ''settled the synergistic question in the sense of the Gnesio-Lutherans,'' and that ''an aggressive Luther tradition is followed,'' and that ''in not a few passages the Swabian view seems to be dogmatically stated'' in the Article on the Person of Christ.‡ Kurtz expresses himself in about the same way as to the characteristics of the Bergic Book. He says: ''This document dealt with all the controverted questions that had been agitated since A. D. 1530 in twelve articles. It set forth the doctrine of the Person of Christ, giving prominence to the theory of ubiquity as the basis of the doctrine of the Supper, leaving it, however, undetermined in accordance with the teaching of Brentz, whether the ubiquity is to be regarded as an absolute or as a relative one, if only it be maintained that Christ in respect of his human nature, therefore in respect of his body, is present '*ubicunque velit*,' more

* Möller-Kawerau, *Kirchengeschichte,* 3. Ed., III., 293.
† *Preussische Jahrbücher,* 1889, 63 Vol., p. 142.
‡ *Dogmengeschichte,* 4 Ed., 915, 920, 922.

particularly in the Holy Supper. An opportunity was also found, in treating of the synergistic questions, to set forth the doctrine of predestination, although within the Lutheran Church no real controversy on this subject had ever arisen. Luther, who at first had himself given expression to a particularistic doctrine of election, had gradually receded from that position. . . . When now the Formula of Concord, rejecting synergism in the most decided manner, affirmed that since the Fall there was in men not even a spark remaining, *ne scintillula quidem*, of spiritual power for the independent, free appropriation of offered grace, it had gone over from the platform of Melanchthon to that which Calvin, following the course of hard, logical consistency, had been driven to adopt, in the assertion of a doctrine of absolute predestination. The Formula was thus, in the main, in agreement with the speculation of Calvin. But it declined to accept the conclusions arrived at in Calvinism by declaring that, while man indeed of himself wanted the power to lay hold upon divine grace and to coöperate with it in any way, he was yet able to withstand it and to refuse to accept it. In this way it was able to hold by the express statements of Scripture, which represent God as willing that all men should be saved, and salvation as an absolute work of grace, but condemnation as the consequence of man's own guilt. It regards the salvation of men as the only object of Divine Predestination, condemnation as the consequence of the divine foreknowledge." *

Now, it is exactly this extreme development that has brought the Formula of Concord into inconsistency with the older Lutheran Confessions, and even with itself. Melanchthon purposely kept the doctrine of Predestination out of the Augsburg Confession, because of the inextricable controversies to which it would lead.†

The doctrine of Free-will, contained in Article II. of the Formula of Concord, cannot be logically deduced from Article XVIII. of the Augsburg Confession, nor from the discussions of the same subject in the Apology. It is not the old Lutheran doctrine of Free-will.‡ It is not the earlier teaching of Andreae, Chemnitz, Selneccer and Chytraeus on the subject, as witness their private writings and the Torgau Book. It is essentially

* *Church History*, § 141, 12.

† C. R. II., 547.

‡ See *The Lutheran Quarterly* for April, July and October, 1905, Article: *The Old Lutheran Doctrine of Free-will.*

the teaching of Flacius, and harmonizes well with the demands made in the Prussian censure. Hence it is not possible to reconcile the doctrine of Free-will contained in Article II. of the Formula of Concord with the doctrine on the same subject contained in the older confessions without reading something into the conclusion that is not contained in the premises of the older confessions.

And a similar difficulty arises in regard to Article II. and Article XI. in the Formula of Concord. In Article II. it is taught that man is like a block, a stone, yea, even worse than these, that "in conversion man is absolutely passive," and that "conversion is the work of God alone."

The logical conclusion from all this is the doctrine of *absolute predestination* and the doctrine of *irresistible grace.* It rests with God whether a man is converted or not. Not all men are converted; therefore it is not the will of God that all men shall be converted, or that the promise of salvation should appertain to all men. But in Article XI. it is said "that not only the preaching of the Gospel, but also the promise of the Gospel is universal, that is, appertains to all men" (Müller, p. 709). Also, it is declared in the Formula "that God has ordained by his eternal counsel that the Holy Spirit shall call the elect, illumine, convert, and justify all those who with true faith embrace (German: *annehmen;* Latin, *amplector*) Christ and will confer on them eternal life" (Müller, 712-713).

But *embracing* is an action of the will. It is a choice. The person who *embraces* is not "absolutely passive," is not a block or a stone. If this *embracing,* or this *choosing to embrace,* or the *power to embrace,* be wrought in some who hear the Gospel, and not in others who hear it, then we have *particularistic election.* If man, under the "preaching of repentance," and with that illumination of the Holy Spirit which the Lutheran theology teaches, always accompanies the preaching of the Divine Word, can "embrace Christ by true faith," then it was wrong to say "that the unregenerate man cannot apply himself to grace," for regeneration does not come before justification, neither does it come before repentance, nor before embracing Christ by true faith. Hence, Kurtz is right in saying that the Formula went over to the platform of Calvin. That it does not draw the conclusions that were drawn by Calvin results from the want of "logical consistency," or from a failure to draw the conclusions involved in the premises.

Candid Lutherans have recognized the dilemma in which the Formula of Concord involves itself. Martensen says that the Lutheran theory has taken an unfortunate turn, and that its "formula involves a return to Calvinism. Freedom of choice is transformed into a mere shadow, for whatever is the subject of foreknowledge must have its foundation in an eternal law of necessity. The relation in which the free choice of man stands to the divine election of grace cannot be the object of God's *fore*-knowledge, though it is certainly the object of his *joint*-knowledge."* Kahnis: "The second Article, *De Libero Arbitrio,* rejects synergism to the behoof of the rigid Augustinian doctrine of grace which works all in all. On the contrary, the eleventh Article, *De Aeternitate et Electione,* declares against the Augustinian doctrine of Predestination in the Calvinistic sense. . . . The proposition that the rejection of salvation has its ground in man neutralizes not merely the doctrine of Predestination, but also the doctrine of grace in the Formula of Concord. This proposition demands, according to irrefutable logic, that the man who can reject salvation is not without will (willenlos) in the appropriation of salvation. For he who can resist and does not resist wills not to resist. And he who wills not to resist wills to receive."† Dr. Julius Stahl, after stating that "in all the confessions of the Lutheran Church, in those which were composed by Luther and in those which were composed by Melanchthon, there is not even the trace of a doctrine of Predestination," declares that the treatment of the Formula of Concord on the doctrines of Free-will and Predestination is certainly in need of better definition and of correction (pp. 540, 543).‡ Luthardt has expressed himself thus: "It has often been charged against the Formula of Concord that its second and eleventh Articles do not agree. The answer to the predestination question is indeed a fortunate inconsequence, but an inconsequence. The logical conclusion from Article II. is the absolute Predestination. For if man can contribute absolutely nothing to his salvation, then the entire decision in regard to the eternal destiny of individuals lies solely in the hand of God. The Formula of Concord does indeed concede to the natural man the ability externally to hear the Word; but this purely

* *Christian Dogmatics,* p. 367.
† *Dogmatik,* II., 543.
‡ *Die Lutherische Kirche und die Union,* pp. 217-218.

external act is without real moral significance. The whole weight of eternity cannot hang on this slender thread." *

Thomasius thinks that we have in the Formula of Concord antithetical propositions, which we are not required to carry out logically. But against this it may be said that it does not belong to a confession to state its propositions antithetically, nor to seek to reconcile truths that stand over against each other, nor to state truths that stand over against each other in such a way that the one logically carried out contradicts the other. For such a procedure produces not so much a confession of faith as a discussion of dogma, and such is exactly the way in which competent Lutheran scholars have characterized the Formula of Concord: "In it [the F. C.] one cannot miss the warm pulse-beat of a direct confession, and that could not be otherwise, for its purpose is to render doctrinal decisions, and hence it is a treatise on dogma, rather than a confession. But despite its undeniable incongruities, and regardless of the attitude one takes toward it, as a treatise on dogma it must be regarded as one of the most important achievements of the sixteenth century." †

But one may ask whether a treatise on dogma, wrought out under the conceptions of the Aristotelian philosophy, and by the aid of the scholastic terms that still abounded in the theology of the sixteenth century, has the proper qualities for a binding confession of faith in the twentieth century. Besides, a treatise on dogma, composed for the purpose of settling theological controversies, is one thing, and has its own definite end in view. A confession of faith composed for the purpose of witnessing to what is believed and taught in our churches is quite another thing, and has its definite end in view. As a treatise on theological dogma, the Formula of Concord must be rated very high. Some of its expositions are most thoughtful and judicious. No theologian can afford to ignore it. Every Lutheran theologian ought to appreciate it as showing how certain theologians at a certain period in the history of the Church were brought, under certain circumstances, to express themselves concerning certain articles of the Augsburg Confession. But the Formula of Concord can be no more regarded as the final explanation of any article of the Augsburg Confession than Luther's *Commentary*

* *Die Lehre vom Freien Willen*, p. 276.

† Kolde, *Einleitung*, p. lxxiii. See an excellent characterization of the Formula in the Möller-Kawerau *Kirchengeschichte*, 3d Ed., III., p. 293.

on Galatians can be regarded as the final exposition of the great Apostle's masterpiece on justification by faith. The Formula of Concord is a historical document, and consequently it must be judged historically. If the history of the world be the judgment of the world, equally is the history of the Formula of Concord the judgment of the Formula of Concord.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

SUBSCRIPTION TO THE FORMULA OF CONCORD.

THE Bergic Fathers regarded their second revision of the Torgau Book as final.* There was to be no opportunity for criticism, and no appeal from its explanation of the controverted articles. Hence they named it: *A Final Repetition and Explanation,* etc. They counsel against holding a general synod, about which, both privately and officially, they had previously written. They now fear that dangerous opposition would be developed in a synod, and that the work of concord would be defeated. So they express themselves in their Report to the Elector of Saxony, done at Bergen, May 28, 1577. The Elector of Saxony was greatly pleased with the counsel, and at once began to procure the subscriptions of the theologians, superintendents and pastors in Saxony. The Elector of Brandenburg expressed himself emphatically against holding a synod, and expressed himself in favor of procuring the subscriptions as speedily and as unceremoniously as possible. Hence he advises "that a copy (of the Bergic Book), as it has now been determined *(confirmirt)* according to the censures of the churches, be sent again to the Princes, and that subscriptions to it be *categorically* demanded and taken; and further, that the same shall be demanded of courts and cities by some neighboring Princes. When this shall have been done a synod can be better and more safely thought of, in which the other articles can be fully discussed." †

Now it was in the spirit of these counsels that the work of obtaining subscriptions to the Formula of Concord was conducted. The Electors, respectively, of Saxony and Brandenburg, were essentially of one mind on the subject. They sent copies of the Bergic Book with their benedictions to the Princes, with the request that they should multiply copies and send them to counts, lords and cities for subscription. They were to require subscription, first from the doctors of theology and the consistorial theologians, and then from superintendents, pastors

* Chemnitz's *Letter;* Bertram, *Das Evangelische Lüneburg,* II.; Beylagen, p. 365.

† Bertram, *Das Evang. Lüneburg,* Beylagen, II. Theil, pp. 635, 63.

and teachers of each place. The names of those who refused to subscribe were to be placed in a catalogue, which was to be sent to the Electors that they might know who were suspected and heterodox.

It was thought that the demand for subscription would meet with little or no resistance in Saxony and Brandenburg. And so it turned out in the main. The will of such despotic Princes as August and John George was law, though many objections were raised, especially in Saxony, and many misgivings had to be quieted, and not a few persons subscribed with a bad conscience. As the matter of subscription was doubtful in Hesse and in Anhalt it was resolved to send no copies of the Formula of Concord into those countries, but to invite some of the theologians of those lands to a colloquy with the theologians of Saxony and Brandenburg.*

Thus subscription to the Formula of Concord was obtained diplomatically, and not by proper and ecclesiastical methods. Professor Kolde has stated the case accurately, only with reference to some of the Princes when he says: "Wherever the civil authorities were in favor of the Formula, there, as a rule, the men of the Church were compliant. That the wish of the ruler contributed to the result is not to be denied, and is confirmed by the Crypto-Calvinistic troubles which came up later in Saxony. But that the influence of the rulers is not to be too highly estimated, as very soon was done by the opponents of the Formula of Concord, is shown, among other things, by the addition: 'With mouth and heart,' that is frequently found among the subscriptions." † Kolde does not seem to have taken into his account the fact that the commissioners, appointed to procure the subscriptions, were instructed to make a catalogue of the recusants. Professor Karl Müller has stated the case more comprehensively and better in accordance with the facts, when he says that "some Princes threatened simply to banish from the country everyone who did not subscribe," and then observes in strict harmony with the facts that "the Estates had undertaken the publication; *they* subscribed the Preface; *they* have come to an agreement in regard to the controversies of their theologians; *they* enjoin this Concordia upon their dominions,

* For the details of the facts condensed in this and in the preceding paragraph, see Hospinian, Chap. XIX.; Hutter, Chaps. XVII. and XIX.; Anton, pp. 214-216; Heppe, pp. 216-218; Planck, VI., 553-560; Pressel, *ut supra*, pp. 38 *et seqq.*; Kolde, *Einleitung*, p. lxxiii.

† *Einleitung*, p. lxxiii.

churches, schools, successors for instruction and as a warning. The theologians—about eight thousand subscribed—appear only at the end of the entire Book, not as legislators or as participants in the work of legislation, but only as a sign of their agreement, of their submission. The will of the ruler has decided everything. The Estates elevate, *each for its own dominion,* the new Book to the position of a doctrinal code. Each Estate is by its subscription not a representative of the entire Church of the Augsburg Confession, but a representative of its own territorial Church, or rather of its own territory. Taken all together they do not even constitute *the* Church of the Augsburg Confession, not even the 'Lutheran' half of it, but at most a part, more correctly a part of the *Estates* of the Augsburg Confession." *

Of the Estates of the Augsburg Confession in Germany, about two-thirds subscribed the Formula, the following refused their subscription: Brunswick, Wolfenbüttel, Holstein, Hessen, Pomerania, Anhalt, the Palatinate, Zweibrücken, Nassau, Bentheim, Tecklenburg, Solms, Bremen, Danzig, Magdeburg, Nürnberg, Weissenburg, Windsheim, Frankfurt, Worms, Speyer, Strassburg, also the county Ortenburg and the Silesian principality Lignitz.† Brunswick accepted the Formula at first, but afterwards rejected it on account of Duke Julius' antipathy to Chemnitz. In Silesia the Lutheran churches had not been racked by the Lutheran controversies. The King of Denmark threw the two elegantly bound copies, sent him by his sister, the Electress of Saxony, into the fire with his own hands, and forbade, under severe penalty, the introduction of the Formula into his dominions.‡ Some of the territories and cities named above, subsequently accepted the Formula of Concord, and some which had at first accepted it (besides Brunswick) rejected it. The Preface was signed by 3 Electors (Saxony, Palatinate, Brandenburg) 20 Princes, 24 Counts, 4 Barons and 29 free cities.§

1. *The Method of Obtaining Subscriptions.*

The Elector of Saxony commissioned Jacob Andreae, Nicholas Selneccer and Polycarp Lyser, at that time Superintendent in

* *Preussische Jahrbücher,* February, 1889, pp. 142-3.

† Kolde, *Einleitung,* p. lxxiii., note; Müller, *Preussische Jahrbücher,* February, 1889, p. 143.

‡ *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theologie,* 1850, p. 662; Möller-Kawerau, *Kirchengeschichte,* III., 296.

§ Kolde, *Einleitung,* p. lxxiii.

Wittenberg, to conduct the matter of obtaining the subscriptions in his dominions. His letter to the clergy and all concerned is as follows: "We have given command to Dr. Jacob Andreae and Nicholas Selneccer as to what they are to do and accomplish for the advancement of the salutary work of concord which has been begun in these dominions, as you will learn from them; and it is our desire (Begehr) that you will see to it that the Superintendents and all the pastors, ministers of the churches and school teachers shall appear without fail at our castle in Wittenberg at six o'clock in the morning of Tuesday the twenty-fifth day of this Month," that is, of June, 1577.*

It was the requirement of the Elector that every pastor should sign with his own hand. The beginning was made at Wittenberg. From Wittenberg the commission went to Hertzberg, Torgau, Meissen, Dresden, and to all the other important cities in Electoral and Ducal Saxony. "The procedure in carrying on the work was as follows: In every place to which they came they met the ministers and school teachers who had been summoned from the smaller towns and villages, and made an address, in which they related briefly how their gracious Lord, the Elector, had labored for several years to remove the unfortunate schisms and controversies in the Church, and how, finally, the Formula of Concord had been composed and everywhere examined and adequately approved. They then read the Formula and exhorted the assembly to examine it with reference to its agreement with the Word of God. They also requested that everyone should express any doubts or scruples that he might have, in order that they might be removed. They also demanded that those who could bring nothing against it should acknowledge it and subscribe their names to it without reservation. The demand was so effective, and the information given to the doubting so convincing that in all the Electorate only one pastor and one superintendent, and only one school teacher in the Weimar district, were found who were so wilful as to refuse subscription." †

Andreae asserted in the colloquy with the Anhalt theologians at Hertzberg, in 1578: "I am able to say truly that no one was forced to subscribe, nor was any one banished. This is as true

* Pressel, *ut supra,* p. 39. This order is dated June 19, 1577. Pressel, *ut supra,* p. 39, note.

† Planck, VI., 558-560. In Planck the date of beginning at Wittenberg is Jan. 15th. Manifestly a typographical error. Anton and Heppe give June 15th as the date of beginning. Pressel draws from archival sources.

as that the Son of God has redeemed me with his own blood."* But already, October 8th of the previous year, when the work in Saxony had been completed, Andreae had written to Chemnitz: "Ever since I separated from you I have been away from home, that I might finish the work that had been begun. It has succeeded most fortunately. Not only did we receive unqualified subscriptions, but we treated the pastors with such severity, that a very good sincere minister said to us afterwards at the hotel, that he was thunderstruck when the matter was conducted with such severity that he heard the law of Moses promulgated from Sinai. . . . I do not believe that equal severity was used in any place."† Hutter concedes that "some subscribed with a bad conscience."‡

In Brandenburg the subscriptions were obtained in about the same way as in Saxony. Andrew Musculus, George Coelestin and Christopher Koerner were appointed to assemble the preachers at convenient places and to obtain their subscriptions. Very unimportant objections were found to the Formula, and it was accepted and subscribed with thankfulness to the Holy Trinity. At a convention held at Lebus, July 22d, the clergy subscribed unconditionally and also "thanked the faithful, pious ruler for his fatherly care of the Church which had been so harshly attacked and persecuted by the sects and heretics."§

In lower Saxony and in the maritime cities the work of obtaining subscriptions was conducted mainly by Chemnitz, and that, too, in large part at his own expense. In this work he was greatly encouraged by the Elector of Saxony, who, June 7, 1577, wrote him a very flattering letter, which shows that the Elector of Saxony and the Elector of Brandenburg were acting in concert to promote subscription in Brunswick, Lüneburg and the cities on the sea.|| February 15, 1578, Chemnitz reports that

* Hutter, Cap. XX.

† Quoted by Rehtmeyer, III., 460, as proof that "where the people were not willing to subscribe *categorically*, they were at once threatened with expulsion from office." See *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theol.*, 1848, p. 285.

‡ *Libri Christianae Concordiae*, Prolegomena, p. 20. J. G. Walch, the ardent apologist for the Formula of Concord, writes: "We cannot deny that in this matter there were not some human weaknesses." Gottfried Arnold has shown from original documents that, in instances, the subscriptions were *demanded*, and that the ministers had the alternative of subscribing or of being dismissed from office, and that, at least to a large extent, the Formula of Concord was forced upon its subscribers. He who would refute Arnold at this point must show that he garbled or falsified his authorities. *Unpartheyische Kirchen-und Ketzer-Historie, Neue Auflage*, I. Tom., pp. 815-817.

§ Pressel, *ut supra*, p. 43.

|| Letters in Rehtmeyer, *Beylagen*, Nos. 55, 56.

he assembled the theologians of the various localities, and that the matter was so conducted that in all the churches "the subscriptions followed without exception unqualifiedly and categorically." Only in Westphalia was there some hesitation.* There is no evidence that threats and violence were employed in obtaining subscriptions in Brunswick-Lüneberg. But it was under the influence of Duke Julius that in Oldenburg the subscription made to the Formula of Concord by the Count was accompanied with the declaration: "No one will be tolerated in the country who shall speak, write or do anything against the Formula of Concord,"† and in the dominion of Duke Julius, at the Riddagshausen Convention, 1576, before the signing of the Formula, it was decided, "that no minister, no teacher of the Church, shall be received or tolerated, who, either in thesis or in antithesis, shall preach, write, dispute, speak or dictate anything contrary to the Formula of Concord, or shall countenance the errors and corruptions which have been rejected, or shall gloss, defend or cloak the same."‡

In Würtemberg subscriptions were obtained in July, August, September and October. Duke Ludwig issued a proclamation in which he calls attention to the many controversies that had sprung up among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, and to the efforts of Electors and Princes to remove the same. He then says that "the Formula of Concord has been already subscribed by all theologians, ministers and teachers of the Church in the two Electorates, and in other Electorates and principalities, and in the other Estates of the Augsburg Confession subscription is going on, and the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg have graciously desired of us that we also have the above-named writings subscribed in our dominions by all our theologians, ministers and teachers as an evidence of Christian consensus: Therefore it is our gracious command (gnädiger Befehl) that ye will read the writings herewith transmitted and subscribe both copies with your own hands without supplement or condition in such a way that everyone indicates his baptismal name and his surname and the office and place in which he serves in Church or in school." The work of calling the ministers together and of obtaining the subscriptions was entrusted to Dr. Luke Osiander and Hippolitus Resch. The

* Pressel, *ut supra*, pp. 44, 45; Lentz, *Zeitschrift für Historische Theol.*, 1848, p. 284.

† Lentz, *ut supra*, p. 287; Planck, VI., p. 563.

‡ Lentz, *ut supra*, p. 287.

first to subscribe were the theologians at Tübingen, then the consistory at Stuttgart. These were followed by prelates, abbots and pastors throughout the territory. No opposition was made; at least none is reported; and, October 7th, the Duke reported to Andreae the success of the undertaking.*

In Mecklenburg, Chytraeus was charged with the business of obtaining subscriptions to the Formula of Concord. Six Superintendents met at Gustrov, the residence of the Duke, November 12, 1577. They carefully read the Formula and then returned it to the Duke with the following subscription: "*We, the Superintendents of the churches in the duchy of Mecklenburg, have read this book in the fear of the Lord and approve it quoad summam rerum* [that is, in essentials] *and so testify by this our subscription.*" About the same time the Formula was subscribed by the theologians and ministers at Rostock.

It is evident that the subscription rendered by the six Superintendents did not please the Duke; for, November 20th, he commanded the same six Superintendents to summon synods, each in his own diocese, to read the Formula carefully to the ministers, and kindly to invite each one to subscribe. "But if they are not yet convinced of the truth of the doctrines, and refuse subscription, time shall be given them for deliberation. But meanwhile let them abstain from all criticism of it before the people, unless they are willing to submit to the penalty of removal." Subscription was refused only by the Superintendent of Wismar and one or two pastors. These were suspended from office, and forbidden to preach. Later they were dismissed from office, when it was learned that they still persisted in their refusal to subscribe the Formula.†

At a convention held, January 12, 1579, Margrave George Frederick of Prussia laid the Formula of Concord before Bishop Wigand and the assembled clergy, and requested them to examine it; and in case they should find it in harmony with the Word of God to subscribe it. They subsequently reported that they had subscribed the Formula because "it was not contrary to any article of faith," though opposing teachers had not been named and refuted as they had desired. They regarded it as a useful work and asked the Prince to have it printed. "When now the book was returned to the Prince subscribed by

* Original documents given by Pressel, *ut supra*, pp. 46 *et seqq.* See Heppe, III., 248.

† Schütz, *Vita Chytraei*, II., 420 *et seqq.*; Planck, VI., 565, note 52; Heppe, III., 255.

the preachers, he sent an official mandate to all officials, pastors and teachers throughout Prussia and commanded them to subscribe it, which was also immediately done. It was then ordered this same year, 1579, that henceforth in the church visitation inquiry should be made whether the preachers in the territory teach according to the *Corpus Doctrinae Prutenicum* and according to the Formula of Concord." *

But the subscriptions were not obtained without reservations and protests for the protection of consciences. The situation in Prussia was also complicated by the bitter antagonisms that had arisen between Heshuss and Wigand. But the Margrave issued a new command, which, he hoped, would induce the theologians to lay aside their condition.† However, the professors of theology at Königsberg did not subscribe.‡

Thus have we described briefly the methods by which subscription to the Formula of Concord was obtained in the more important territories and cities of the German Empire, and in Prussia, which was not at that time a part of the Empire.

Those who are in search of fuller and detailed information on this subject are directed to read Pressel's *Churfürst Ludwig von der Pfalz und die Konkordienformel,* found in *Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie,* 1867. This article of 323 pages, "according to the Originals of the Dresden and Stuttgart Archives and a Collection in the Library at Gotha," contains much information never before given to the public in print. This article may be supplemented by Johannsen's article in the same *Zeitschrift* for 1847, entitled: *Die Unterschrift der Concordienformel in Sachsen;* and by Superintendent Lentz's article in the same *Zeitschrift,* 1848, entitled *Die Concordienformel im Herzogthum Braunschweig.* Heppe's somewhat detailed account, Vol. III., 216 *et seqq.,* presents much valuable information.

Our instances are typical. We may say: From these few we learn that the methods used for obtaining subscriptions were identical in spirit rather than in the details of their execution. Politics, statecraft and diplomacy entered largely into the execution. It cannot be denied that in some instances subscription was enjoined by the civil authority. In other instances the will of the ruler was clearly made known. Andreae confesses that he treated the pastors with "such severity" that they seemed

* Hartknoch, *ut supra,* pp. 487-8.

† For a lengthy essay on the *Fluctuating Attitude of the Churches in Prussia,* see Pressel, *ut supra,* pp. 521 *et seqq.*

‡ Hartknoch, *ut supra,* p. 488.

to hear the law proclaimed from Sinai. It cannot be said that the rulers used the method of Mohammed: *The Koran or the sword.* But it cannot be denied that in some instances, if not in all, the ministers and teachers, whose rulers had approved the Formula of Concord had the alternative presented, either expressly or by implication, of subscribing or of being discharged from the post of pastor or teacher. That is, the poor preachers and teachers were practically helpless. They were not in a position to assert their independence. It was not safe to resist the will of the ruler. In the main the work of concord had been conducted by the civil rulers. The work of obtaining the subscriptions had been ordered by the rulers and was conducted according to their command. In most instances, indeed as a rule, the ministers had not been consulted in regard to the composition of the Formula of Concord, and now no time nor opportunity was allowed for that careful examination of its contents, which the gravity of the situation imperatively required. The entire movement was precipitated. The clergy and the teachers were commanded to assemble and to subscribe categorically. A single public reading of the Formula and reply to objections raised were all that was allowed. This was utterly inadequate for making a proper acquaintance with the contents of the Formula, and for consulting with one's conscience and convictions. The rulers and the Bergic Fathers acted in conjunction, the former promptly following the recommendation of the latter, that a synod should not be held, and that the work of obtaining the subscriptions be immediately begun. Hence in every proper sense of the word the Formula was *imposed* upon the Church by the State, and not *accepted* by the Church in the full unconstrained exercise of her freedom, and after it had been discussed and adopted by a representative synod in accordance with the historic procedure of the Church in matters of that kind. And beside this act of usurpation on the part of the State, and the haste, the facts justify (especially in the case of Saxony) the unqualified declaration that "the work of subscription was conducted with all kinds of artifices of concealment" (Verschweigungskünsten).*

That many, perhaps very many, of the eight thousand and more clergymen, who subscribed, did so "with mouth and heart," and because they honestly believed that the Formula contained nothing contrary to God's Word, is true beyond the

* Möller-Kawerau, *Kirchengeschichte,* III., p. 294.

shadow of a doubt.* Many, perhaps all, were heartily tired of the long years of controversy through which they had passed. Some preferred bread to conviction. But there were some churches and some ministers who would not subscribe, who cannot on account of such refusal be charged with Crypto-Calvinism. We have space here to instance only three such churches.

2. *Three National Churches.*

The churches in Schleswig-Holstein were regarded just as orthodox as were those of Lower Saxony. Under the General Superintendent Paul von Eitzen the churches of this duchy had introduced a soundly Lutheran *Corpus Doctrinae,* which included among other doctrinal standards the following: The Augsburg Confession, the Apology, Luther's two Catechisms, and the Schmalkald Articles. They had repudiated the Calvinists expressly, and had declared that they had not in the least deviated from Lutheran standards; and yet Schleswig-Holstein was among those territories which declined subscription to the Formula of Concord. Andreae and Selneccer wrote to Eitzen, and the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg sent a copy of the Bergic Book to Duke John the Elder of Hadersleben. But all to no effect. Objection is made to the many scholastic terms employed in the Book, and that errors are condemned which have been long dead, and are known only to the learned, and especially that "Jacob Andreae and his five compeers have assumed this general authority over all the churches which adhere to the Augsburg Confession, and that they, without the authority of a general synod, have set forth their book in the name of a general confession and as a unanimous, clear interpretation of the Augsburg Confession to be accepted and subscribed by the churches everywhere, so that those who refuse such acceptance and subscription are to be suspected of Crypto-fanaticism." Further: "After a careful comparison of this Book with the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther, the *Loci Communes* of Melanchthon published during the lifetime of Luther, we find that the explanation of the correct doctrine in the said books and writings is composed and set forth better, plainer, more orderly, more intelligibly, more thoroughly than is done in this Formula of Concord. Therefore, since we must speak according to our consciences, without regard to the authority of

* Selneccer, *Recitationes,* p. 65.

men, we must say that some articles are set forth in such confusion and are so defective that we cannot regard and approve this Book as a correct, clear, plain confession or explanation of the Augsburg Confession, by which the unity of the true doctrine can be maintained against all kinds of errors and be promoted, so that by the reception of this formula as a general confession, the Augsburg Confession and the books which heretofore have been held as a true explanation of the same, and to which we have bound ourselves by oath with a good conscience to stand by, shall be brought under suspicion." At the same time Paul von Eitzen presented for himself reasons why he could not subscribe the Formula of Concord. At a synod of theologians, held in October, 1577, three censures were issued. Various objections were raised to the Formula: It had ignored Melanchthon and his writings, and contained "some new expressions that are unheard of, dark and not sufficiently intelligible." While in general the Formula is in harmony with the older symbols, "it is necessary to distinguish between the propositions that are necessary and profitable and other accidental, subtle and profound queries." "They will not, by a hasty subscription, bring disorder and confusion upon their churches which have hitherto been united. Hence subscription is declined, modestly, conscientiously and finally."* There is no doubt that the synod was influenced by the General Superintendent. But though a friend of Melanchthon's, Paul von Eitzen was nevertheless an adherent of Luther's doctrine, as the oath of subscription which he introduced into the churches of Schleswig-Holstein clearly demonstrates.

Much effort was made to obtain subscription to the Formula of Concord in Pomerania. In October, 1577, Chemnitz went to Pomerania in order to confer with the Pomeranian theologians of Wolgast,† and in November of the following year he wrote a long letter to Superintendent Jacob Rung, in which he undertakes to explain many things in the Formula.‡ May 12, 1578, the Report of the Pomeranian churches on the Bergic Book was presented at a synod held in old Stettin. It points out the changes that had been made in transforming the Torgau Book into the Bergic Book. The theologians condemn "the statement

* For details see Johannsen, *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theologie,* 1850, pp. 638 *et seqq.;* Pressel, the same *Zeitschrift,* 1867, pp. 504 *et seqq.;* Heppe, III., 308 *et seqq.;* but especially *Dänische Bibliothek,* 1747, VII., 1-178.

† Lentz, *ut supra,* p. 285; Rehtmeyer, III., p. 461.

‡ Given by Rehtmeyer, III., Beylagen, pp. 299 *et seqq.*

of the controversy'' on Free-will as the same is presented in the Formula. They say that many of them as students at Wittenberg had heard the doctrine of Free-will set forth by Luther and Melanchthon just as it is taught in the *Loci Communes*. So they themselves have taught. They deny that Melanchthon had ever taught that man, by his own powers, can believe the Word of God or can give his consent or can by his own powers fit himself for conversion. Melanchthon had taught that the will of man is not wholly inactive when moved by the Holy Spirit.'' * At a synod held in August, 1581, these objections, as regards substance, were reaffirmed, with the declaration that the authors of the Formula had been warned by the Rostock Faculty not to reject the union of the three causes in conversion.† And Jacob Rung, Superintendent, went so far as to say that ''the authors of the Formula wanted to expurgate Calvinism; but with great skill they confirmed and introduced Flacianism.'' ‡ But as proof positive that the Pomeranian theologians were not inclined to Calvinism, it was declared at a General Synod held in Stettin in March, 1577, that the Pomeranian churches accept the articles on the Lord's Supper, on the Person of Christ, on Predestination and Election, on Original Sin, as they had been set forth in the Torgau Book; also the article on Free-will as set forth in the same Book with the understanding that Melanchthon's doctrine of Free-will is in fundamental harmony with that of Luther on the same subject. The Pomeranian clergy revolted especially against the changes that had been introduced into the Bergic Book, though they by no means approved the Torgau Book as a whole. They even approved in the main the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and that of the Person of Christ as set forth in the Bergic Book, though they wished the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* to be improved and that the belief of the presence of Christ in the Supper be based upon the words of institution rather than on the dogma of the personal union of the natures of Christ, and on the dogma of the right hand of God. They also object to the exaltation of the Mayence copy of the Augsburg Confession to the highest place. The Torgau Book was emphatically rejected. In the

* Balthaser's *Andere Sammlung zur Pom. Kirchen-Historie,* pp. 116 *et seqq.*

† *Ut supra,* pp. 231 *et seqq.*

‡ See *Acta* of this General Synod in Balthaser's *Erste Sammlung,* pp. 325 *et seqq.*

year 1593, portions of it were introduced into the *Corpus Doctrinae Pomeranicum.*

Nürnberg, as we have long ago learned, had its *Normal Book,* which contained, among other standards of doctrine, the catechisms of Luther and the Schmalkald Articles, though the Nürnbergers were warmly attached to Melanchthon. In September, 1577, Margrave George Frederick of Ansbach, sent a copy of the Formula of Concord to the Senate of Nürnberg with the request to have it signed categorically by the ministers and teachers, inasmuch as it had been signed by the clergy in Ansbach and in many other territories. The ministers of the city affirm their adherence to their *Normal Book,* and complain of some of the doctrines contained in the Bergic Book, as, that man in conversion is a block, a stone, a pillar of salt, worse than a wild beast. They object to the article on the Law and Gospel as in contradiction to the Augsburg Confession, also they object that the true presence of Christ in the Supper should be based "on the ill-devised and hitherto unheard of ubiquity or omnipresence in all creatures." They object to the manner in which the subscriptions had been obtained as contrary to the practice of the Church. A synod should be called to examine the Bergic Book. That these Nürnbergers were neither Calvinistic nor Crypto-Calvinistic is shown by the fact that they affirm that in the Lord's Supper the true essential body and blood of Christ are received alike orally by the worthy and by the unworthy who use the sacrament according to the institution of Christ. They are also grieved that where the Augsburg Confession is named as norm of doctrine "reference is made by name and expressly only to the first unaltered Augsburg Confession." *

3. *The Main Objections.*

The objections raised by other states and cities to the Formula of Concord agree in the main with those advanced by Schleswig-Holstein, Pomerania and Nürnberg. They gather for the most part round the article on Free-will, the doctrine of ubiquity used as a support of the doctrine of the real and essential presence of Christ in the Supper, and the exclusive use of "the unaltered Augsburg Confession," whereas it was known and could be proved beyond all doubt that the editions of 1540, 1541, 1542, had been again and again sanctioned as authentic explanations of

* Original matter given by Heppe, III., 299 *et seqq.,* notes, and by Planck, VI., 589, 590, note.

the Confession that had been delivered to the Emperor in 1530. The doctrine of ubiquity had been employed by Luther in his controversy with Zwingli, and had not been formally revoked by him, neither had it been subsequently employed by him as a basis of his doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Supper; but it had become his habit to appeal to the words of institution as a reason for believing such presence. The point was made that while the doctrine of ubiquity was a private view of Luther's, it had not become *Lutheran* doctrine, and could be found nowhere in the older creeds. Its introduction into the Formula of Concord was regarded by many theologians as an attempt to make Luther's private view on this subject confessional for the entire Lutheran Church, whereas up to that time it had become normative only in Swabia.

And as for the doctrine of Free-will it was an undeniable fact that Luther had allowed the harsh Determinism of the *De Servo Arbitrio* to drop into the background, and that during Luther's lifetime, Melanchthon's modification of Luther's doctrine of Free-will had been accepted without controversy in the Lutheran Church, and without objection from Luther, yea, even with his approbation, since he had placed his unqualified *imprimatur* upon the *Loci Communes*. Even more.

It could not be denied that the Melanchthonian doctrine of Free-will had been endorsed and expounded by at least four of the authors of the Formula, and, in some of its essential features, had been set forth in the *Swabian-Saxon Concordia* and in the Torgau Book. Of course there were minor objections, and some that were purely local. But refusal to subscribe the Formula cannot be charged to the influence of Crypto-Calvinism, as some of the older writers, who narrated in the interest of prejudice rather than in that of scientific history, were accustomed to allege. Modern investigators have shown by the use of official documents that the great majority of those who rejected the Formula, some with more, some with less, decisiveness, were adherents of all the older confessions, and bequeathed them, or at least the Augsburg Confession, unimpaired to their descendants. While some of the descendants of those who subscribed the Formula withdrew from the Lutheran Church, as will be more specifically shown hereafter.

Thus we see that the sphere of the influence of the Formula of Concord was limited at the beginning, and that such sphere became subsequently diminished; and it has continued to dimin-

ish until to-day only about one-third of the Lutherans of the world include it among their symbols. It is the present custom of the vast majority of Lutheran theologians to accord it high theological value, to apologize for it as a child of its time, and to quote it for the support and confirmation of didactic views. The number of those who find it to be the expression of their personal faith, in the sense in which it may be supposed to have expressed the theological convictions of those who composed it, is very small indeed. Theological study, and especially the study of Symbolics, has changed the point of view, and has brought the distinction between the substance and the form of the Confessions which is now almost universally recognized by Lutheran theologians.

4. *The Effect of Subscription.*

The Formula of Concord in aiming to become the defining symbol of Lutheranism put an end to some distracting controversies and unified and solidified the adherents of the Augsburg Confession in by far the larger part of Germany. Theologians in the universities of the Princes who had adopted it, as a rule, bound themselves to teach in harmony with its explanation of the articles of which it treats. The result was the stately Lutheran Dogmatic of the seventeenth century, which has been compared to the splendid cathedrals of the Middle Ages, and which ranks, and will continue to rank, as one of the most objective, acute, learned, intellectual, elaborations of Christian dogma that has yet appeared, and that is likely to appear in the Church Militant, and which is indispensable for the dogmatic training of the Lutheran theologian, notwithstanding the fact that it is exclusive in conception, scholastic in form, and deficient in its application of the Lutheran material principle that the faith which *believes* is more important than the faith which *is believed*, that is, as Martensen has phrased it, the Formula of Concord has overlooked the fact that "the saving agent is not chiefly a definite *quantum* of doctrinal propositions, but the communication and reception of the principle of the *new* creation." *

The Lutheran Dogmatic of the seventeenth century simply carried out logically the premises of the Formula of Concord until it developed orthodoxy into the orthodoxism which preceded the advent of Pietism under the labor of Spener and Francke, which brought into practical application the old Lutheran teach-

* *Christian Dogmatics*, Eng. Trans., p. 37.

ing that the Gospel is the promise, the teaching, the preaching of the forgiveness of sins and justification for the sake of Christ; whereas in the Formula of Concord it is declared that "the Gospel is properly the doctrine which teaches what that most wretched sinner ought to *believe* in order that he may obtain the pardon of sins with God" (Müller, p. 637).

Saving faith is now regarded as an intellectual apprehension of dogma rather than as confidence in the promise of the Gospel and absolute surrender to a personal Christ. The purview has been changed. The *fides explicita* rather than the *fides implicita* is regarded as absolutely necessary to salvation. Hence Kawerau, writing of "the drawbacks" of the Formula of Concord, after quoting the passage just quoted above, says very properly: "A proposition by the side of which stands the good evangelical declaration: 'To believe is to place one's entire confidence on Christ alone,' but which is yet not only 'unfortunately worded' (Seeberg, D. G. II., 371), but it must work greater confusion the more innocently it is identified with the evangelical conception of faith. The way was opened for an intellectual contemplation of religion. A new scholastic dogmatic overgrew the old simple Confession of the Evangelical Church. A period of prosperity was introduced, but one fatal to the *Church of theologians.*"*

But while the Formula of Concord did very generally settle former and contemporaneous controversies in the larger part of the Lutheran Church in Germany, it gave rise to new controversies. At different times and in different places its adherents fell out among themselves, but especially was its introduction followed by war between those who accepted it and those who rejected it. The former insisted on making it a test of soundness in the Lutheran doctrine, especially in the articles of Free-will and of the Lord's Supper. They were not satisfied when the latter appealed to their own *Corpora Doctrinae,* denied all sympathy with Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism, and with the Calvinistic doctrine of the Supper. It was insisted that, as a test of sincerity, they must express themselves in the very language of the Formula. The reply that the theory of absolute passivity in conversion and the dogma of ubiquity could not be found in the older confessions, nor in the generally accepted dogmatic teaching, was not sufficient to save the recusants from severe condemnation, though their refusal to subscribe the Formula

* Möller-Kawerau, *Kirchengeschichte,* 3 ed., III., 295.

did not deprive them of their Lutheran character, nor debar them from the enjoyment of the rights and privileges guaranteed by the Religious Peace of 1555.* Hence, notwithstanding the efforts of the zealots, the Formula of Concord did not attain to the distinction of being made, or of being regarded as, the test of Lutheranism, not even in the case of those who denied that its explanations are faithful and logical developments of the corresponding articles of the older confessions. When Duke Julius renounced the Formula, he and his people returned to the *Corpus Julium,* and the Duke offered means and assistance to any who would refute the doctrine of ubiquity.† The University of Helmstädt became the home of a Lutheran theology which was not bound by the Formula of Concord. Indeed, Calixtus declared that, had he been required to pledge himself to the doctrine of ubiquity, as set forth in the Formula of Concord, he would not have settled at Helmstädt.‡

The next century witnessed the prolonged controversy between the Universities of Tübingen and Giessen, both of which were attached to the Formula of Concord. Giessen defended *Kenotism,* that is, that Christ during the period of his humiliation utterly abstained from the use of the divine attribute; the Tübingen theologians maintained that Christ used his divine attributes secretly. This controversy has been described as "an after-effect of the still remaining dissonances, so laboriously concealed in the Formula of Concord." And certain it is that the doctrinal controversies that have distracted and separated the Lutherans in America have sprung out of the Formula of Concord, which in some cases is differently understood by those who subscribe to it, and in some cases it is held up as the final test against those who have not accepted it. Hence it is not possible to say truthfully that the Formula of Concord has been an *instrument* of concord within the Lutheran Church, since not a few Lutherans who have held it, have stood in a state of violent discord with each other; and bodies of Lutherans in America which stand in a state of violent discord toward each other at the present time, are uncompromising adherents of the Formula of Concord.

Such has been the history of the Formula of Concord in its

* Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology* (Eng. Trans.), I., 383; Möller-Kawerau, *Kirchengeschichte,* 3d ed., III., 296; Eng. Transl., III., 295.

† Rehtmeyer, III., 488-9.

‡ *Ibid.,* 489; Walch, *Streitigkeiten,* IV., pp. 530 *et seqq.*

effect within the Lutheran Church. It is a historical document. Its history, whether it support or controvene preferences and preconceived opinions, ought to be plainly and fully told. Harmony in the Lutheran Church cannot be promoted by concealment. To uncover its history is the duty of the historian who undertakes to write the confessional history of the Lutheran Church. Those who admire it most and find in it the expression of their faith should be the first to present in detail the facts connected with its history, and should be the last to find fault with those who have undertaken to do what they themselves have not done. The chief regret of the present writer at this point is that the plan and compass of his work does not permit him to enter into details. But, in addition to the sources of information already given, we point to Planck's *Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie,* Vol. VI., 690 *et seqq.,* and pp. 816 *et seqq.,* and to the first three chapters of his *Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie von der Konkordienformel an bis in die Mitte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts.* Planck has fortified his statements and conclusions by constant references to and quotations from the sources of information. He has never yet been shown to be wrong in any point that is essential to his narrative.

But there is another of the effects of the subscription and introduction of the Formula of Concord that cannot be passed over in silence: It made a complete and irreconcilable breach between the Lutherans and the Calvinists, and drove thousands of the friends and followers of Melanchthon into the ranks of Calvinism, which in Germany appeared, confessionally, for the most part in the Heidelberg Catechism. Some have regarded this separation as inevitable. Others have held that it is a merit in the Formula of Concord that it hastened and completed the separation. In the attacks made on the Formula by the devil and his organs, the heretics, Hutter sees a clear proof that it was composed by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, "a norm and form of sound doctrine," in complete harmony with the infallible Divine Word.*

The Formula was assailed from different quarters. In 1579 Christopher Herdessianus, a Nürnberg syndic, under the name of Ambrose Wolf, published two books against it. The next year he issued his *Historie von der Augsburgischen Confession . . . er wider die Patres Bergenses vnd anderen Vbiquitisten verführischen Betrug.* Quarto, pp. 637. Printed at *Neustadt an*

* *Concordia Concors,* Chap. XLI.

der Hardt. In 1581, Ursinus and other theologians who had been banished from Heidelberg when the Formula was introduced in the Palatinate by the Elector Ludwig, published *Admonitio Christiana,* quarto, pp. 455, printed at *Neustadt an der Hardt.* In the same year the preachers at Bremen published in quarto a defense of their doctrine of the Person of Christ, the sacraments, election and ceremonies. In the same year the theologians of Anhalt sent for a censure on the Preface to the Book of Concord. In the same year Christopher Irenaeus, a confirmed Flacianist, in his *Examen libri Concordiae,* "dared to attack what had been taught in the Formula of Concord on original sin." Books had also appeared at Geneva, in 1578 and 1579, against the Formula. Even the ministers of Belgium had addressed a letter "to the Authors of the Bergic Book." *

The chief objections raised against the Formula of Concord in these attacks have to do with the Person of Christ and the Lord's Supper. The Anhalt theologians protested especially against the confounding of the Son of Mary with the Son of God. The *Admonitio Christiana* defends the Calvinistic doctrine of the Supper as chiefly a communion in which Christ imparts to us the benefits of his body and blood. It denies the doctrine of oral manducation as diametrically opposed to the Scriptures. Ambrose Wolf attacked the doctrine of ubiquity and that of the Lord's Supper, as set forth in the Formula, in the interest of the union of the Lutherans and Reformed as set forth in the Wittenberg Concord of the year 1536.

To refute these and other "objections" and "calumnies" against the Formula of Concord, Timothy Kirchner, Nicholas Selneccer and Martin Chemnitz drew up what is known as the *Apologia, oder Verantwortung des Concordien Buchs,* sometimes called the *Erfurt Book,* because it was composed at Erfurt.† The first part, written by Kirchner, but with preface signed also by the other two, is directed against the *Admonitio Christiana* of the Neustadt theologians and the censure of the Anhalt

* See titles and descriptions of this polemical literature against the Formula of Concord in Walch, *Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten,* I., 165 *et seqq.;* Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica,* I., 376 *et seqq;* Feuerlin-Riederer, pp. 194 *et seqq.;* Walch, *Introductio,* pp. 734 *et seqq.;* Kolde, *Einleitung,* p. lxxvii. The copy of the Erfurt Book in our hands was published in Dresden in 1584. Fol. It does not contain Part III. See Walch, *Bibliotheca,* I., 378; Feuerlin-Riederer, p. 205.

† It was composed at Erfurt in the Autumn of 1581, was revised in May, 1582, at Brunswick, and completed at Quedlinburg in January, 1583. For an extended account of the composition, revision and publication of this famous book, see Heppe, *Geschichte der Luth. Concordienformel,* II., 284-311.

clergy. It defends the doctrine of ubiquity, but denies that the essential divine attributes are imparted to the human nature of Christ. It bases the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper both upon ubiquity and upon the words of institution. But the human nature of Christ, because of its union with the divine nature, is to be adored. This first part was published at Heidelberg in 1583. It consists of 227 large folia. The second part forms the reply to the Bremenese. This also was written by Kirchner, and was published at Heidelberg in 1583. It contains 167 folia. The title is: *Warhaffte Christliche und gegründte Widerlegung,* etc. At the very beginning it denies that the authors of the Formula of Concord ever taught that "Christ is present in all created things, in leaves, in grass, in stone, in wood, in all unclean places." It also denies an adequation of the two natures of Christ. But it defends the doctrine of the true essential presence of Christ in the Supper, and oral manducation of his body by all communicants, by a Judas as well as by Peter and all saints. "The body of Christ, which is present in the Supper, is distributed in a supernatural, heavenly manner and in no sense enters the stomach after the manner of other food." The third part, also composed by Kirchner, is entitled: *Refutatio Irenaei,* published at Heidelberg in 1583. Quarto. The fourth part of the *Apologia,* composed by Chemnitz and Selneccer, is entitled: *Gründliche Warhafftige Historie von der Augspurgischen Confession wie die anno 1530 geschrieben,* etc. It is sub-titled: *Bekentnis der Augsp. Confession vom heiligen Abendmal.* It consists of 519 pages folio, and was printed at Leipzig in the year 1584. In content this part is a chronological history of the sacramentarian controversy "against the imaginary, hypocritical, falsified History of Ambrose Wolf." It aims to show how the Augsburg Confession in the Article on the Lord's Supper has always been understood and defended by and in the pure churches and schools, viz., that in the Lord's Supper Christ is truly and essentially present, and is administered to all who eat and drink in the Supper.*

This Erfurt Book, of which parts I., II., IV. aggregate 1307 folio pages, is the most learned defense of the Formula of Concord that has ever been written. It is composed in the polemical style of its time, though it is less violent and abusive than many

* For particulars about editions, dates, titles, etc., of this Erfurt Book, see Feuerlin-Riederer, pp. 204 *et seqq.*, and Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica.* I., 377 *et seqq.;* Walch, *Introductio,* p. 736.

of its controversial contemporaries. Its special characteristic is, that it, perhaps more than any other book, determines the *meaning* of Articles VII. and VIII. of the Formula of Concord by fixing upon the former Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper as set forth and defended in his polemical writings, and by fixing upon the latter the Swabian Christology—neither of which had the consensus of the Lutheran Church, and which have not had the consensus of the Lutheran Church to this day.

The Erfurt Book was enhanced in authority and influence by the fact that it had been composed by the command of three Electors,* and by the fact that it had been carefully examined by friendly theologians before it was published. But it did not put an end to the controversy which the Formula of Concord had excited. The Neustadt theologians published *A Defense of the Admonition against the Sophisms and Cavils of the Erfurt Apology.* The theologians of Bremen and Anhalt also made reply to the Erfurt Apology. These rejoinders called forth counter-rejoinders, and so the controversy proceeded from bad to worse, with the result that the one party became more ardent in its support of the Formula and the other more bitter in its opposition.† The friends and pupils of Melanchthon, who saw and heard themselves denounced as Calvinists and sacramentarians, and perceived that the purpose of the Formula of Concord was to fix *Lutherism,* rather than *Lutheranism,* upon the Lutheran Church, became estranged from the Lutheran Church and constituted themselves the Reformed Church in Germany, with the Heidelberg Catechism as their doctrinal standard.

This was done in the Palatinate in 1583-5, when John Casimir, the guardian of the youthful Frederick, united himself with the Reformed and took the great majority of the people with him.‡ Anhalt became Reformed in 1588; Zweibrücken in 1588; Hanau in 1596; Hesse in 1604-6. In 1613-14, John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg,§ renounced the Formula of Concord and accepted the Reformed faith, whereby the royal house of Prussia,

* Walch, *Introductio,* p. 736.

† Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica,* I., 379 *et seqq.*

‡ Struve, *Pfälzische Kirchen-Historie,* pp. 110 *et seqq.* See also Good, *Origin of the Reformed Church in Germany,* pp. 307 *et seqq.;* Gieseler, IV., 493; Möller-Kawerau, 3d ed., III., 299 *et seqq.* Differences in dates. John Casimir dismissed 400 Lutheran ministers from office, as his brother, Ludwig, on introducing the Formula of Concord, had dismissed 500 Reformed ministers.

§ See the *Confessio Sigismundi,* 1614, and Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom,* I., 555-6.

and now the imperial house of Germany, became Reformed, so that its members are instructed in the Heidelberg Catechism. Whence also the union in the nine old Prussian provinces, where the Augsburg Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism are placed on confessional equality, and this has brought about the transference of the hegemony of German Protestantism from the Palatinate and Saxony to Brandenburg-Prussia.

Such, in part, were the effects of the subscription of the Formula of Concord, and of the methods employed for its introduction into the Lutheran Church. The learned and impartial Lutheran historian, Dr. Mosheim, has exhibited the whole situation as follows: "This new Confession of the Lutheran faith was adopted first by the Saxons in consequence of a strict order of Augustus; and their example was followed by the greatest part of the Lutheran churches, by some sooner, by some later. The authority of this Confession, as is sufficiently known, was employed for the following purposes: First, to terminate the controversies which divided the Lutheran Church, more especially after the death of its founder; and, secondly, to preserve that Church against the opinions of the Reformed in relation to the Eucharist.

"This very Formula, however, which was designed to restore peace and concord in the Church, and had actually produced this effect in several places, became a source of new tumults, and furnished matter for the most violent discussions and contests. It immediately met with a warm opposition from the Reformed, and also from all those who were either secretly attached to their doctrine, or who, at least, were desirous of living in concord and communion with them, from a laudable zeal for the common interest of the Protestant cause. Nor was their opposition at all unaccountable, since they plainly perceived that this Formula removed all the flattering hopes they had entertained of seeing the divisions that reigned among the friends of religious liberty happily healed, and entirely excluded the Reformed from the communion of the Lutheran Church. Hence they were filled with indignation against the authors of this new confession of faith, and exposed their uncharitable proceedings in writings full of spirit and vehemence. The Swiss doctors, with Hospinian at their head, the Belgic divines, those of the Palatinate, together with the principalities of Anhalt and Baden, declared war against the Formula; and accordingly, from this period the Lutheran, more especially the Saxon, doctors were

charged with the disagreeable task of defending this new creed and its compilers in many laborious productions.

"Nor were the followers of Zwingli and Calvin the only opposers of this Formula. It found adversaries even in the very bosom of Lutheranism, and several of the most eminent churches of that communion rejected it with such firmness and resolution, that no arguments or entreaties could engage them to admit it as a rule of faith, or even as a means of instruction. It was rejected by the church of Nürnberg, by those of Hesse, Pomerania, Holstein, Silesia, Denmark, Brunswick and others. But they all united in opposing it. Their opposition was founded on different reasons, nor did they all act in this affair from the same motives or the same principles. A warm and affectionate veneration for the memory of Melanchthon was, with some, the only, or at least the predominant, motive that induced them to declare against the formula in question; they could not behold without the utmost abhorrence a production in which the sentiments of this great and excellent man were so rudely treated. In this class we may rank the Lutherans of Holstein. Others were not only animated in their opposition by a regard for Melanchthon, but also by a persuasion that the opinions, condemned in the new creed, were more conformable to truth than those substituted in their place. A secret attachment to the sentiments of the Helvetic doctors prevented some from approving the Formula under consideration; the hopes of uniting the Reformed and Lutheran churches engaged many to declare against it; and a considerable number refused their assent to it from an apprehension, whether real or pretended, that the addition of a new creed to the ancient confessions of faith would be really a source of disturbance and discord in the Lutheran Church. It would be endless to enumerate the different reasons alleged by the different individuals or communities, who declared their dissent from the Formula of Concord." *

Planck has examined the subject with great thoroughness. After showing that the chief objections to the Formula of Concord revolved round the doctrine of ubiquity and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as related to the doctrine of ubiquity, and after pointing out that the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as so related, was made the touchstone of pure Lutheranism, and subscription to the Formula of Concord was demanded as evi-

* Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern*, English Translation, pp. 167 *et seqq.*

dence of true Lutheranism, and that many who refused to subscribe had always protested their adherence to the Lutheran doctrine as the Lutheran Church had publicly confessed it—after a detailed description of such things, Planck asks: "What, then, must be the consequence of pressing upon such men a distinction in reference to the Lord's Supper contained in the new Formula of Concord, with its doctrine of ubiquity, which, according to most positive convictions, is neither tenable nor capable of proof, and had never been a doctrine of the Lutheran Church?" His answer is as follows: "Only this could result, and only this did result, that not only many individual theologians, but also many churches, which had belonged hitherto to the Lutheran party, from this time on approached nearer and nearer to the Calvinistic Church, and soon went over formally and fully to it. In the year 1580, when the Formula was published, there were only two churches in Germany which had definitely declared themselves in favor of the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, namely, that at Bremen and the church at Neustadt on the Hardt, where the Palsgrave John Casimir had his residence, or in that part of the Palatine lands which had fallen to his inheritance. But at the close of the century, or within the next twenty or thirty years, probably fully one-fourth of all the Protestant churches in the Empire had gone over fully to that party. And yet this was such a natural result as could not possibly fail to follow. Already during the preliminary transactions about the reception of the Formula, which took place before its publication, the preachers of numerous churches, as those of Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, Anhalt and Zweibrücken, had declared most distinctly that they would never allow the hypothesis of ubiquity to be thrust upon them, either as an auxiliary idea in the doctrine of the Supper, or as a defining idea in the doctrine of the Person of Christ; and yet, just as decidedly, in part, did they declare that they were bent upon holding and confessing in the doctrine of the sacrament the genuine Lutheran presence of Christ in the language of the Augsburg Confession, yea, even in the unaltered Confession. Thus they sufficiently legitimated themselves as genuine members of that Church which had made this Confession her own, and had hitherto made nothing else than its reception the condition of her fellowship. But in the Formula of Concord belief on that ubiquity is now enstamped on the creed of the Lutheran Church. By this, also, it was proclaimed that all those who do not accept

it are no longer members of the Lutheran Church. Soon it was loudly declared that those could no longer be sharers in the benefits of the Religious Peace, since that had been concluded alone with the Lutheran party. They were told to their faces that they could be regarded as nothing better than Calvinists. Yea, they were now generally distinguished by the name of Crypto-Calvinists. Hence, what could be more natural than that indignation and bitterness, and at the same time prudence and self-protection should in a short time cast many of them completely into the arms of the Calvinists, and now really for the first time should make of them the very thing which hitherto, with the greatest injustice, they had been proclaimed?

"Thus it happened, and it happened so according to the most natural course of things, that the very party which, first of all, they desired to suppress in Germany by means of the Formula of Concord—that the Calvinistic party now for the first time gained also firm footing here, and secured for itself forever the continuance of its existence. This was the unfortunate consequence which on the one hand came to the Lutheran Church from the movement. But on the other hand, its theology secured the advantage that now for a century and a half it remained fixed on the point on which it had been firmly bound by means of the Formula of Concord." *

It will be perceived that these historians agree in regard to the essential facts. Conclusions essentially different from theirs could not have been legitimately drawn from the sources of information which were in their hands. Subsequent investigations, with additional sources of knowledge in hand, have not only confirmed, but have widened the scope of their conclusions. After careful and prolonged examination of by far the larger part of the official and other trustworthy literature in connection with the composition, subscription and introduction of the Formula of Concord, and also of very much of the controversial literature which followed its introduction—much of it not known to Mosheim and Planck—we hold the following propositions to be historically incontrovertible:

1. The Formula of Concord was *forced* upon the churches by the Princes in the manner described in a preceding part of this chapter. Under the circumstances the superintendents, theologians, pastors and teachers had little or no option in the matter. In some instances the alternative was: *Subscribe or*

* *Geschichte der Protest. Theologie,* etc., pp. 19 *et seqq.*

quit the country. In other instances the alternative was: *Subscribe or suffer dismission from office.*

2. The *chief* objections raised against the Formula of Concord were the hypothesis of ubiquity, and the uses made of that hypothesis as a basis of the doctrine of the real bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper; whereas it was contended and shown that the doctrine of ubiquity was not a part of the doctrinal consensus of the Lutheran Church.

3. The great majority of the Lutheran churches which rejected the Formula of Concord vindicated their Lutheran character by appealing to the older Lutheran confessions and by continuing to use their Lutheran orders of worship.

4. The Formula of Concord was the cause of the most bitter controversies, dissensions and alienations. The position taken by adherents of the Formula of Concord that this document is the true historical and logical *Explanation* of the older confessions, and is therefore the test and touchstone of Lutheranism, had the effect, as one extreme generates a counter-extreme, of driving many individual Lutherans and many Lutheran churches into the Calvinistic fold, as that fold was represented in Germany by the Heidelberg Catechism as the chief confession of faith.

And now, in the presence of these propositions, which can be established, and must be established, by every historian who searches and writes in the interest of historical science, and not for the purpose of supporting a prepossession, the question naturally arises, Did the Formula of Concord do more harm than good? The answer which the dogmatician would give to this question will be determined by his attitude toward the distinguishing dogmatic features of the Formula itself. But the question is one for historical solution by the use of all the facts involved. Any effort made wisely and conscientiously to abate and to terminate doctrinal controversies in the Church is, in the abstract, worthy of all commendation. But the execution of such an effort must always be considered in relation to the concrete methods and results. The history itself must constitute the basis of judgment. To say that the divisions and separations would have come anyhow, is to beg the question. Many of the controversies of the fifth, sixth and seventh decades of the sixteenth century had run their course and had disappeared below the horizon. Even the synergistic controversy is generally represented as having run its course by the year 1567, though undoubtedly resonances of it could still be heard. The contro-

versy on the Lord's Supper had to a large extent been extinguished by the downfall of Crypto-Calvinism in Electoral Saxony. It is certain that the distractions and alienations at the middle of the seventies had to a large extent subsided. This is clearly implied in the Proposition which the Elector of Saxony laid before the Lichtenberg Convention in February, 1576, in which it is declared that of the originators of the strife some are dead and others have been used up by controversy, and have probably become more tractable.*

The bitterness and the alienation were not as great as they had been. The Augsburg Confession, and, in many instances with it, the other older confessions, still constituted the bond of Lutheran unity, and distinguished the Lutherans from the Roman Catholics and the Calvinists. Proof of this lies in the fact that the Lutherans were called, and were known as, adherents of the Augsburg Confession. The vast majority of Lutherans were still loyal to the historical teaching of those confessions. The Gospel was preached purely, and the sacraments were administered according to the Gospel. The same bonds that constitute Lutheran unity in Germany to-day constituted it in Germany in the fifties, sixties and seventies of the sixteenth century; and as those bonds did not then restrain the Lutheran theologians from controversy and strife, so they do not restrain Lutheran theologians from controversy and strife to-day.

But the controversies in the Lutheran Church during the first half century of her existence no more destroyed the essential unity of the Lutheran Church and the essential identity of Lutheranism, than the same are destroyed by the controversies in the Lutheran Church of the twentieth century. There was a Lutheran consensus then, clearly defined, without the Formula of Concord, just as there is a Lutheran consensus now, without reference to the Formula of Concord. Disagreements among Lutherans to-day on points of doctrine or Articles of Faith embraced in the older confessions do not now drive Lutherans into the ranks of the Calvinists. There is no reason to believe that the disagreements of Lutherans in the fifties, sixties and seventies of the sixteenth century would have done so. It was the introduction by authority, and often by compulsion, of new dogmatic explanations as tests, together with the bitter denunciations and persecutions that followed, which caused such large secessions from the Lutheran ranks. A new cause of strife, one

* Hutter, Chap. IX., p. 77.

more energetically and influentially pressed, began to operate.

Hence, taking into account the bitter controversies to which the Formula gave rise, the secessions from the Lutheran Church, of which it was the direct cause, the hard and dry orthodoxism which it produced, together with the attendant dead formalism of the congregations, and the Lutheran schisms which in these days are directly traceable to its expositions—taking all those things into account, we believe that the impartial verdict of history will be that the Formula of Concord has done more harm than it has done good, and that the Lutheran Church would be numerically stronger, more closely united and more aggressively active, had the Formula of Concord never been written. It was called Formula of Concord while it was in course of preparation, and with reference to the end in view. The word CONCORDIA stands at the head of the Book of Concord of which the Formula forms a very large part. But at no time has it been an instrument of concord for the entire Lutheran Church. Its unreconciled antitheses have from time to time started new controversies in the Lutheran Church; and the spirit of controversy and condemnation which it breathes in the *negativa* connected with every article except one (the IX.). and which it has communicated to so many of its adherents, has helped to make the Lutheran Church the most controversial of all the Protestant communions.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE BOOK OF CONCORD.

THE Book of Concord is the collection of *the Symbolical Writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church,* and was published officially at Dresden, June 25, 1580, or just fifty years after the delivery of the Augsburg Confession. All the parts of which the book is composed, except the Formula of Concord, had been long in print in various forms and in various relations. Under the direction of Jacob Andreae, assisted by Archdeacon Peter Glaser and Dean Caspar Füger of the *Kreuzkirche* in Dresden, the printing began as early as in the year 1578.

1. *The Editio Princeps.*

Martin Chemnitz, in a very long letter, dated November 7, 1580, speaks of two editions of the Book of Concord.* Professor Kolde is of the opinion that, "speaking accurately, only *one* official Dresden edition appeared in the year 1580, the exemplars of which, as known to us, show in parts very considerable differences." † He bases his opinion on information furnished by Polycarp Leyser, and regards this information as in essential agreement with the representations made by Chemnitz. Leyser reports that the printing was conducted hastily; that single sheets were printed and sent to individuals; that objections were raised by theologians and Princes, some on account of individual parts, and some on account of typographical errors. This led to the reprinting of isolated sheets, which were sent to individuals. But not all who received these had, in binding, put them in the places of the defective sheets; also the printers put out mixed exemplars.

Professor Kolde names the following as the most important differences:

"1. Out of regard for the people of Upper Germany, especially for the Elector of the Palatinate, who had taken offense at the Exorcism in Luther's *Order for Baptism,* the Dresden Consistory, under the principle that such things belong not to

* Hutter, fol. 360 *et seqq.*
† *Einleitung,* LXXX. See Heppe, IV., 221 *et seqq.*

doctrine, but to ceremonies, resolved to omit the *Order for Baptism* and the *Order for Marriage*. But when the sheets in question became known, objection was raised by the Elector of Brandenburg, Duke William of Lüneburg, and especially by Chemnitz. The Elector ordered their restoration. During the negotiations Chemnitz, in order to satisfy all, proposed that 'Luther's Small Catechism should be so printed in the Book of Concord that the *Order for Marriage* and the *Order for Baptism* could be introduced or could be removed.' As this plan was pursued, there came to be exemplars which contain these two parts, those (which were printed first) which simply omitted them, and those which indicated their omission and the place where they were to be introduced if desired. And this was done in such a way that the last page of the Small Catechism carries at the same time the page numbers 169, 170, 171, 172, 173. 2. Some exemplars have as title over *The Catalogue of Testimonies* the word *Appendix*, while in the case of others, at the desire of the Elector of the Palatinate, because these had not been a matter of conference (as others suppose in order not to assign to these [Testimonies] an authority equal to that of the Formula of Concord itself), the word *Appendix* was omitted. 3. In the Formula of Concord (p. 269a, Müller, 595, compare readings) the citation is made from Article XX. of the Augustana according to the quarto edition of 1531 as it is in the manuscript. But Chemnitz, who called attention to the discrepancy of the text printed in the Formula of Concord, which is based on the Mayence manuscript, occasioned the reprinting also of this sheet. The result was a new difference of exemplars, especially one that has been paraded by the enemy." *

Professor Kolde also calls attention to the fact that some copies have at the close, after the subscriptions, a separate page, which contains two passages from the IX. Psalm, together with a printer's mark bearing the names Matthes Stöckel, and Gimel Bergen and after the printer's mark the false date M.D.LXXXI., which in other exemplars has been falsely corrected to read M.D.LXXIX. We have in our hand at this moment a copy with such a separate page, with such a printer's mark, and with such names, but the date given as the printer's mark is 1579, followed by: Gedruckt zu Dresden / durch Matthes Stöckel. Anno M.D.LXXX., that is, "Printed at Dresden by Matthes Stöckel," etc.

* *Einleitung*, p. lxxx, *et seqq.*

The Feuerlin-Riederer describes seven exemplars of the Book of Concord, printed at Dresden in the year 1580. These all differ, in one way or in another, from each other. But it is impossible to believe that seven separate editions were printed at Dresden in the same year. Balthaser had in hand an exemplar that had belonged to Duke Ulrich. It contains the *Order for Marriage* and the *Order for Baptism.* He regards this as the first impression. He had in hand another exemplar, which omits the orders for Marriage and Baptism, and differs here and there in other unimportant particulars from the preceding. He also had a third exemplar in hand, which differs from both the others. It nowhere exhibits the date 1579, as is done by both the others, though all three bear: DRESDEN, MDLXXX. on the chief title-page. The copy in the hands of the writer differs from all three described above, and comes in order, he thinks, between Balthaser's second and third, in that in a couple of places it contains the date 1579, and in other test places it has a text that is identical with Balthaser's third exemplar. This shows that the corrections were not all made at the same time. But we agree with Professor Kolde in concluding that, as with the *Editio Princeps* of the Augsburg Confession, so with the Book of Concord, there are not different editions, but one *Editio Princeps*—"only *one* official Dresden edition of the year 1580"—though there are important textual deviations here and there.*

2. *The Contents of the Book of Concord.*

We describe the Book of Concord according to the exemplar of the *Editio Princeps* now in our hands.

1. The title, rendered into English, is as follows: CONCORDIA. יהוה. Christian, Repeated, Unanimous Confession of the following named Electors, Princes, and Estates of the Augsburg Confession, and of the Doctrine and Faith of the Theologians who have subscribed to the same at the end of the Book. Together with an Explanation, well-founded and based on the Word of God as the sole Rule, of some Articles, which, after the death of the Sainted Dr. Martin Luther, came into

* See Anton, II., 6 *et seqq.* Since the preceding description of exemplars of the first Dresden edition was written, another exemplar of the same edition has come into the hands of the writer. This differs from those described. In some places this edition has *italicized* letters where the other edition in the writer's hands has the ordinary upright letters, and *vice versa.* In some instances the colophons are different. The names of the subscribers were not printed from the same forms. But the title-pages of the two are identical.

discussion and controversy. By unanimous agreement and command of the said Electors, Princes and Estates, put into print for the instruction and warning of their lands, churches, schools, and descendants.

With the privilege of the Elector of Saxony.

DRESDEN. M.D.LXXX.

2. The Preface, which is signed by 3 Electors, 22 Princes, including 2 Counts who are ranked with the Princes, 22 Counts, 4 Barons and 35 Cities, was written by Jacob Andreae, at least in outline, and was at first communicated to Duke Julius and to a few other Estates. It was adopted at a convention held at Jüterbogk in January, 1579, and in February of the same year it was revised by some theologians and civil counsellors at Cloister-Bergen.*

The Preface recognizes the Augsburg Confession as a certain symbol of those times, especially in the articles of faith, which have to do with the Roman Catholics; holds it to be the duty of the subscribers to guard against false doctrines; alludes respectfully to the diets of Frankfort (1558) and Naumburg (1561); recites briefly the history of the construction of the *Christian Book of Concord;* expresses the determination to adhere to the Augsburg Confession, to that and to that alone which was delivered to the Emperor in the year 1530, and which, in the original, is still preserved in the Imperial Archives; says that "the other edition of the Augsburg Confession" had been used to conceal errors, especially in regard to the Lord's Supper; but it is added: "We never understood nor received the other edition as opposed to the first delivered Augsburg Confession, nor have we rejected or wished to condemn other very useful writings of Master Philip Melanchthon, also of Brentz, Urban Regius, Pomeranius and others, in so far as they agree with the rule contained in the Book of Concord;" in the administration of the Lord's Supper it inculcates adherence to the words of institution; it warns against the use of abstract terms in the doctrine of the person of Christ. The majesty of the human nature of Christ does not exist apart from the personal union. It was not the design of the subscribers to condemn those who go astray through simplicity of mind, but to condemn fanatics and obstinate teachers. They intend that in their dominions,

* Anton, p. 242; Loescher, III., 294; Rehtmeyer, III., 469, 470.

churches and schools, no doctrine shall be taught except that which is founded on the Word of God and is contained in the Augsburg Confession and in the Apology. That they may carry out such intention they have resolved to publish the Book of Concord. They know that the doctrine which they wish to inculcate is embraced in the three symbols, in the Augsburg Confession of the year 1530, in the Apology, in the Schmalkald Articles and in Luther's Catechisms. Finally, they express the determination earnestly to maintain the work of Concord by the visitation of churches and schools, by an oversight of the printing offices, and by other salutary means, such as may suit each place. As evidence of all this they sign their names with hearty unanimity and affix their seals.

3. "The three Chief Symbols or Confessions of the Faith of Christ unanimously employed in the Church," that is, the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds.

4. "Confession of the Faith of some Princes and cities Delivered to the Imperial Majesty at Augsburg, Anno M.D.XXX."

Although in the Preface the Princes had again and again declared that they adhere to the Augsburg Confession which was delivered to Charles V. in the year 1530, they nevertheless insert in their Book of Concord a vicious copy of an unauthentic codex, which had been imposed on the Elector of Saxony by the Elector of Mayence and his library officials. This copy of the Confession is essentially identical with that which had been inserted in the *Corpus Brandenburgicum,* 1572. Instead of being "from the true original," it was copied from a codex that represents the Confession in a yet unfinished state, and that has no signatures. It therefore is not the "unaltered" Augsburg Confession or the confession in the form in which it was delivered to the Emperor, neither does it represent the *editio princeps* published by Melanchthon in the year 1531. It differs from this latter in about four hundred places, the great majority of which are entirely without material significance, but some of them do materially affect the sense. The text contained in the Book of Concord is called *Textus Receptus.**

4. "The Apology of the Confession translated from the German by Justus Jonas." This is a free rendering, made with the assistance of Melanchthon, from the Latin *editio*

* See pp. 223 *et seqq.*; also Tschackert, *Die Unveränderte Augsburgische Konfession*, pp. 62, 64 *et seqq.*

princeps, which appeared in connection with the Latin *editio princeps* of the Confession.

5. "Articles of Christian Doctrine which were to have been delivered by our party at the Council of Mantua, or wherever it should be held, stating what we could accept or surrender, or not, etc. Written by Dr. Martin Luther. *Anno* 1537." These are the Schmalkald Articles, which appeared in print first in the year 1538. They consist of a Preface by Luther, of Part I., which treats of the Divine Majesty, Part II., which treats of the office and work of Christ, Part III., which treats of articles which might be discussed among learned and sensible men, together with Melanchthon's tractate on the power and authority of the Pope, written also at Schmalkald.

6. "Enchiridion. The Small Catechism of Dr. Martin Luther, for plain pastors and preachers." Besides the usual five chief parts of the Catechism we have the Form for Confession, Morning and Evening Prayers, the Benedicite and Gratias, the Table of Duties. (The Formula for Marriage and that for Baptism are omitted in our exemplar).

7. "The Large Catechism, German, of Doctor Martin Luther."

8. "Summary Statement of the Articles controverted among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, Explained and Settled in a Christian manner, in the following Repetition, according to the Direction of the Word of God."

With the Privilege of the Elector of Saxony.

DRESDEN. 1579."

This is the Epitome of the Formula of Concord.

9. "Solid, Clear, Correct and final Repetition and Explanation of some articles of the Augsburg Confession about which there has been controversy for a long time among some theologians attached to the same (Confession), settled and adjusted according to the Word of God, and summary statement of our Christian doctrine."

With the Privilege of the Elector of Saxony.

DRESDEN.

ANNO M.D.LXXIX.

This is the *Solid Declaration,* and is followed by the Index and by the names of the eight thousand or more theologians

who signed the Formula of Concord, by two passages from the ninth Psalm, by a wood cut with the names: Matthes Stöckel, Gimel Bergen. 1579.

PRINTED AT DRESDEN BY MATTHES STÖCKEL.

ANNO M.D.LXXX.

10. "APPENDIX. *Catalogue* OF TESTIMONIES of Holy Scripture and of the Teachers of the ancient pure Church," etc.

Printer's mark without name.

DRESDEN.
1580.

Such are the contents, together with a brief description, of the copy of the "*one* official Dresden Edition" of the Concordia or Book of Concord which is in the hands of the writer. Barring the Formula for Marriage and that for Baptism it differs only redactionally from other exemplars of the official Dresden edition, which must always be regarded as standard. In the year 1580 an edition in quarto was published at Magdeburg, and one in folio at Tübingen without the Formulas for Marriage and Baptism, and with differences in the subscriptions.*

3. *The Latin Text.*

In the year 1578 Luke Osiander began to translate the Formula of Concord into Latin. His undertaking was finished by Jacob Heerbrand, Professor of Theology in Tübingen. In the year 1580 a Latin edition of the Book of Concord was published at Leipzig, in quarto, by Nicholas Selneccer "with the grace and privilege of the Elector of Saxony." The title-page bears also the declaration that the Book is published by the joint counsel and command of the Electors, Princes, and Orders of the Empire. In the order of parts and in contents it corresponds exactly to the German *editio princeps* described above, except that it has no Index, and that the names of the signers follow the "Appendix" or Catalogue of Witnesses, and close the book. In the Preface it is declared: "We testify distinctly that we wish to embrace only that first Augsburg Confession which was delivered to the Emperor Charles V. at that celebrated Diet of Augsburg in the year 1530, that alone (we say)

* See Kolde, *Einleitung*, p. lxxv., and Feuerlin-Riederer, pp. 10 *et seqq.*

and no other." But as a matter of fact the Augsburg Confession as printed in this Latin edition of the Book of Concord is a copy of Melanchthon's octavo edition of the Confession printed at Wittenberg in the Autumn of 1531. The same is true of the Apology. It is a copy of that edition which had accompanied the publication of the octavo edition of the Confession; in other words, a *revised* or *altered* edition of the Apology. Hence so far is it from being true that this first Latin edition of the Book of Concord contains "that first Augsburg Confession," etc., it is true, as a matter of fact, that it contains an Augsburg Confession that has been *twice changed*, and an Apology that has been *once* changed—proof this, that the theologians of that period knew very little about the different editions of the Confession and Apology.

This edition contains also other defects. Hence it was not approved, and the Elector August seems to have forbidden its sale.* Selneccer prepared a new translation of the Formula of Concord, which was published in his German-Latin edition of the Book of Concord in 1582. Even this translation did not satisfy the Brunswick theologians assembled at the Quedlinburg Colloquy, December 24, 1582, to January 31, 1583. Under the direction of Chemnitz this translation was thoroughly revised and was inserted in the new edition of the Book of Concord, which was published by official authority at Leipzig in 1584, as an authentic translation of the German text. Therefore the Latin text of the Book of Concord has the same authority as has the German text. It is the Latin *textus receptus*.

In the Preface to this *textus receptus* of the Book of Concord, we find the same declaration as in the Selneccer edition about "that first Augsburg Confession," etc., and in both editions, in *The Compendious Form of Doctrine,* we have the declaration. "We embrace *that first unaltered Augsburg Confession*" (Müller, p. 569). But the Augsburg Confession found in this authentic Latin edition of the Book of Concord is a copy of Melanchthon's *editio princeps*, or first printed edition. There is no reason, however, why it should be called "that first unaltered Augsburg," because we know that Melanchthon in preparing this edition made it differ in many places from the Confession (German and Latin) as the same was delivered to the Emperor Charles V. in the year 1530.† The Apology as printed

* Kolde, *Einleitung*, p. lxxxi.

† See pp. 218 *et seqq.* above. Also Tschackert, *ut supra*, pp. 59 *et seqq.*

in this authentic edition of the Book of Concord corresponds to that which was first printed with the *editio princeps* of the Confession in the year 1531.

This authentic edition of the Book of Concord has been reprinted separately, and in connection with the German authentic text. In the year 1602 an edition was published in octavo with a Preface by Christian II., Elector of Saxony. "Almost all the subsequent Latin editions have followed this edition, even to the numbering of the pages."* Rechenberg's edition, first in 1678, and Hase's edition, first in 1827, are regarded as standard. Among the bi-lingual editions, that published by J. T. Müller in 1847 (tenth edition in 1907) holds perhaps the highest rank.

The Book of Concord has been translated into the Dutch, the Swedish, the Danish, the Norwegian, and the English languages. It has called forth a large amount of literature *pro et contra*, the better part of which may be read with profit by the theologian and by the ecclesiastical historian.† It is not probable that the time will ever come when the Church of Christ on earth will cease to be affected more or less by the Book of Concord.

4. *Subscription to the Book of Concord.*

We must distinguish the Formula of Concord from the Book of Concord, though, since the publication of the latter in the year 1580, the history of each has been closely identified with that of the other. Indeed, a Book of Concord does not exist without the Formula of Concord, and it is the latter, in the main, that determines the minds of men for or against the former. Hence when we speak of the Book of Concord in the Church we might almost as well speak of the Formula of Concord in the Church. That the Book of Concord excited disputes in the Church at once after its publication has been already shown. But objections arose in places from which nothing of the kind had been expected. When subscription was demanded unqualifiedly from the faculties of Leipzig, Wittenberg and Jena, resistance was made at once. Many of the Leipzig professors who had subscribed the Augsburg Confession and the Apology declared that they were perfectly willing to subscribe the Schmalkald Articles and Luther's Catechisms, but that they could not possibly agree with the Formula of Con-

* Feuerlin-Riederer, p. 12.

† For titles of the most important older literature on the Book of Concord, see Walch, *Introductio*, pp. 749 *et segq.*, and Müller's *Die Symbolischen Bücher*, x. ed., p. lxxvii.

cord which contains the new doctrine of Ubiquity. Some of the professors subscribe with the express reservation that they subscribed only to the Augsburg Confession, to the Apology, to the Schmalkald Articles and to Luther's Catechisms. Two of the professors refused their subscription absolutely, whereupon they were dismissed from office.*

When, early in December, 1580, the report came to Wittenberg that the professors would be required to subscribe the Book of Concord, they addressed a memorial to the Elector August in which they gave reasons why they were restrained from complying with the desire of their ruler. January 5th commissioners from the Elector entered Wittenberg, held an interview with the Academic Senate, and then went their way. On the 25th they returned with Dr. Selneccer and Superintendent Avenarius of Zeitz, and during the following three days they treated with the professors individually, first with those of least significance, on the matter of signing the Book of Concord. The result was that the most of them signed the Book. Many of them, only after they had been repeatedly summoned and treated with, consented to sign conditionally. Many of them persistingly declared that they would resign their office before they would yield to the demand of the commissioners. John Mathesius, the life-long friend of Melanchthon, in order to escape subscription resigned his professorship. Only Dr. Wesenbeck was excused from subscribing. All who refused to subscribe were immediately removed from the University.†

In November, 1580, the three Electors sent a commission in common, each, one theologian, and one civil counsellor, to Jena. Here they labored with the professors, as had been done in Leipzig and Wittenberg, fourteen days, before recognition of the Book of Concord was wrung from them.‡

In the Palatinate the most stringent measures were enforced by Elector Ludwig for the introduction of the Book of Concord. Gymnasial professors and numerous professors in the

* Heppe, IV., pp. 245 *et seqq.*

† Heppe, IV., pp. 246-251, and Beilagen No. III., p. 14. Record *ex autographo* in Förstemann's *Liber Decanorum*, pp. 59 and 60: "All these things were done January 26th, 27th, and 28th. Then, February 16th, a mandate was brought in accordance with which all who refused to subscribe the Book of Concord were commanded to leave the university without delay, and the theological faculty was enjoined for the future to command all of whatever profession, in case they were to be numbered among the professors of the university, to subscribe the Formula of Concord, in order that a sure and permanent peace in the matter of confession might be preserved between the professors of all the faculties."

‡ Heppe, *ut supra*, p. 250; Beilagen, No. IV., p. 29.

University of Heidelberg refused to accept it and resigned. In other parts of the Palatinate the subscriptions of the pastors and the teachers was obtained through commissioners, who traveled from place to place for that purpose. "Almost all the preachers subscribed the Book. But Superintendent Schalling and other preachers at Amberg declared that their conscience restrained them from subscribing the new confession. Some of the renitents (among them Schalling) were granted time for consideration. The others were rendered harmless by instantaneous dismissal from office." *

But difficulties of another kind arose in the Brunswick-Lüneburg dominions, where the subscriptions to the Formula of Concord were recalled in 1583. The causes were these: When the Book of Concord was published it was discovered by the Helmstädt theologians and others that the printed exemplars did not in all respects agree with the copy of the Formula of Concord which they had signed in manuscript; and that the Formula had been changed in different places, which ought not to have been done, except by mutual consent. Moreover, the changes were exactly such as would excite controversies afresh. Accordingly, October 23, 1580, the Helmstädt theological faculty wrote to Chemnitz and presented a list of places in which the printed exemplar differed from the manuscript copy.† The latter replied, November 7th, that some of the differences were due to typographical errors, and that the others were of no importance.‡ This answer was not wholly satisfactory to the Helm-

* Heppe, *ut supra,* pp. 251-255. The same facts in regard to the imposition of the Book of Concord on the Universities and in the Palatinate are reported, though in more condensed form, by Anton in his *Geschichte der Concordienformel,* II., pp. 11 *et seqq.* He also reports that the civil authorities of Lübeck sent a copy of the Book of Concord to the ministers and school-teachers of the city, and, as a perpetual reminder of their duty, they had the following Latin inscription placed on it in golden letters: Anno 1580 Senatus Lubicensis hunc librum per deputatos suos Commissarios Ministris verbi in hoc urbe offeri, et mandari curavit, ut formam doctrinae in eo comprehensam in docendo sequerentur, idque manuum subscriptione testificarentur. P. 12. Anton also quotes from two indignant letters which August wrote from Dresden when he learned that the Wittenberg professors did not wish to render an unqualified subscription to the Book of Concord. Among other things, this: Aber ich will durch Gottes Hülfe meine Kirchen und Schulen rein behalten so lange ich lebe, bey der Forma Concordiae. Wer mit mir nicht will, der mag hinfahren, ich begehre sein nicht, etc. Gott behüte mich und die Meinen für Papisten und Calvinisten, ich habe es erfaren. P. 13.

In the face of all these facts, and of many others that can be adduced, it is impossible to deny that the Formula of Concord and the Book of Concord were forced upon churches, preachers, theologians and teachers.

† Letter, etc., in Hutter, Cap. LII., fol. 358 *et seqq.*

‡ Letter in Hutter, Cap. LII., fol. 36 *et seqq.*

städt faculty, neither were they pleased with the Erfurt Apology of the Formula of Concord.

5. *The Quedlinburg Colloquy.*

And now it was that a conference was appointed to be held at Brunswick, May 21, 1582, between the Helmstädt theologians and the three authors of the Apology, Kirchner, Chemnitz and Selneccer, for the purpose of settling the disputes. But Dr. Tilemann Heshusius, who was now professor of theology at Helmstädt, interposed obstacles, so that the proposed conference was not held. Finally in the month of January, 1583, a colloquy of theologians and some civil counsellors was held at Quedlinburg under the auspices of the three Electors and Duke Julius. The Brunswick theologians requested, in the name of their Prince, that a synod should be held; that an explanation of Free-will, different from that given in the Book of Concord, should be composed; that the harsh and unpleasant expressions of Luther be either omitted or modified; that provision be made for the rejection of errors and errorists; that an inquiry be made about the changes that had been introduced into the Book of Concord after it had been signed; that the doctrine of ubiquity should not be officially endorsed as it had been presented in the Erfurt Apology. This last point was discussed two days, January 14th and 16th. The Brunswick theologians complained especially of the changes that had been made in the printed exemplars, more particularly in the article on Free-will, and gave eight reasons why they could not recognize the printed exemplar.

In the Recess of the Colloquy, January 31, 1583, it was decided, that the theologians on both sides should refer the matter of holding a synod to the three electors; that the changes shall be corrected in the Apology; that Luther's expressions can be explained from the context, and by other methods; that errors and false teachers can be condemned when there is need of it; that the matter of changes in general shall be deferred.

The Electoral theologians held that since the Book of Concord had by the grace of God been published, the case should not be opened again to dispute. This was disapproved by the Brunswick theologians, who insisted that the matter be laid before a general synod. The Recess of the Colloquy was rejected by the Brunswick civil counsellors, especially the point in regard to the changes that had been made in the Formula of Concord.

The Brunswick theologians subscribed the Recess, but under protest. In regard to other things the theologians on both sides agreed with clasped hands not to publish the *Proceedings* of the Colloquy, but to look to unity and peace.

The Helmstädt theologians kept their promise to the extent that they never published in print anything touching this controversy, and they never publicly declared that they had become dissatisfied with the doctrine of the Formula of Concord as they had subscribed it. But they reserved to themselves the right to express their views in their lectures to the students. Controversies arose, especially in regard to the doctrine of ubiquity.

Duke Ludwig of Würtemberg wrote to Duke Julius of Brunswick charging that the Helmstädt theologians were not sound in doctrine, and that they had not signed the Formula of Concord honestly. In the year 1585 the Helmstädt theologians defended themselves against the allegation that they had forsaken the Formula of Concord "because they had not approved the unfounded doctrine of the ubiquity of the flesh of Christ." This defense was sent to Duke Ludwig and called forth a reply from the Würtemberg theologians the next year. The Helmstädt theologians replied in 1588, and the Würtembergers again in 1589. Finally the Wittenberg theologians were drawn into the controversy. The chief subject of dispute was ubiquity, but predestination was also discussed.*

At length, June 8, 1589, Dr. Daniel Hoffmann, Professor of Theology at Helmstädt, in a funeral sermon for Duke Julius, expressed himself as follows:

"His Princely Grace at the beginning took an active interest in the work of Concord and promoted it at great cost, anxiety and trouble. . . . And, though some few scribble against the long rejected doctrine of the Book, yet his Princely Grace in accordance with his Princely steadfastness did not wish to depart from the Book of Concord, but he believed that as understood in this place it never contradicted the Confession of the Lower Saxon churches. Therefore he did not approve the method of those who now trifle with this Book, and in order that the sound Saxon interpretation might stand unshaken, his Princely Grace not only was not willing to accept the Apology, by which occasion was given for strange doctrine, but he also

* Walch, *Introductio*, pp. 745, 746; Heppe, IV., 316 *et seqq.*, for much original material. Anton, II., 35 *et seqq.*

maintained before illustrious Electors and Princes that such a book should not be raised to the rank of a common confession," to which Rehtmeyer adds: "And with this the publication of the Formula of Concord, *together with* the Apology in general, lost its authority in these lands, so that the venerable learned Dr. George Calixtus, in his reply to the declaration from Electoral Saxony, wrote as follows: 'It is certain that the Protocol still exists from which it can be proved that Duke Julius, the Founder of this University, was opposed to the doctrine of ubiquity, and offered means and assistance to those who should refute it. I must declare that had I been obliged to bind myself unconditionally to ubiquity according to the words of the Formula of Concord, I should never have settled at Helmstädt.' " *

6. *The Book of Concord and the Lutheran Theology.*

The theology of the Lutheran Church during the seventeenth century, known as the Lutheran Dogmatic, was moulded by the Book of Concord. The theologians of that period held the principle that Holy Scripture is the supreme rule of faith and norm of teaching, but in fact they generally placed the Symbolical Books as a law of interpretation above the Scriptures, under the title *analogia fidei.* The teaching of the Scriptures had been correctly exhibited in the Symbolical Books. Hence they must be interpreted in harmony with the Symbolical Books. That is, the meaning of the Scriptures was already determined. As a consequence *Exegesis* fell quite into the background in most of the universities. In some it was not taught at all; in others it was conducted according to an exegetical tradition which passed from one system to another in such a way that a passage must be explained *just so,* and in no other way; that is, just as it had been explained in the authorized teaching of the Church. Thus *Exegesis,* in so far as it was conducted at all, became the handmaid of an established *Dogmatic.* At Leipzig, 1680-1690, Olearius was unable to have a class in *Exegesis,* and Carpzov generally closed his lectures on Isaiah with the first chapter.†

Philip Jacob Spener, who sadly deplored the lack of Biblical study in his time, speaks as follows of the actual condition: "If in the lectures of the professors a few books were explained, yet

* For fuller information in regard to the Quedlinburg Colloquy, see Hutter, Cap. XLV.; Rehtmeyer, III., 283 *et seqq.;* Walch, *Introductio,* pp. 744 *et seqq.;* G. Frank, *Geschichte der Prot. Theologie,* pp. 259 *et seqq.;* Anton II., 36 *et seqq.;* Leuckfeld, *Historia Heshusiana,* pp. 209 *et seqq.*

† Hassbach, *Ph. J. Spener und seine Zeit,* I., 13.

almost always the explanations were spun out to such length that one could count himself fortunate if he had heard one or two chapters, and most of the classes assembled for the study of the Scriptures turn their attention only to the so-called more difficult passages, as they prefer to say, and in treating such they have in view an end entirely different from that of leading their hearers into the sanctuary of the Holy Scriptures, or of showing them how they are afterwards themselves to engage in the explanation of the Scriptures. From this results to our Church a greater injury indeed than most persons suppose, and we must feel ashamed of it in the sight of our opponents." * And again: "I and other Christians have often complained with sadness that at the Universities the Holy Scriptures are not presented in theological study with all that diligence that the case demands; since they are the sole foundation of our whole theology, and in the case of theological students nothing more important can be done, than unceasingly, or at least chiefly, to teach them how they, by the blessing of God, are to be brought to a correct knowledge and understanding of the Holy Scriptures. As things now go, many very diligent students of theology, who willingly follow the lead of their preceptors, and are well versed in other branches of theology, and diligently prepare thetical and antithetical and polemical discussions and the like, have not in an entire life time mastered a single book of the Bible, and hence, aside from their own cursory private reading and the incidental consultation of the passages which have come up in other matters, have learned scarcely anything in the Holy Scriptures. At least they have never held nor could they conduct an exercise in exegesis." †

Thus the undue exaltation and normalizing of the Symbolical Books in the universities led to the relative exclusion and neglect of the Book from which the Symbolical Books themselves claim to have been drawn. The professors spent the most of their time on Dogmatics and Polemics, and students brought from the universities scarcely anything that they could use in the ministry for the edification of the congregation. Yea, they nearly all imbibed the polemical and dogmatic spirit. As a rule the preaching was controversial, pedantic and scholastic. Tholuck, writing of the preaching of the seventeenth century, says: "In the *middle* of the century, when scholasticism began to spread over everything, every trace of popular quality disappeared,

* *Consilia Latina*, III., p. 421. † *Bedenken*, IV., 457.

and into the place of heartfulness and practical edification entered more and more the didactico-theological performance, in which learned aridity did not even try to counteract the deficiency by florid rhetoric and bombastic phraseology.''* And Kahnis has spoken with equal emphasis on the same subject. He declares that throughout the seventeenth century the pulpit as well as the professor's chair paid tribute to the formal elaboration of doctrine, in which the rules of logic, etymology and synonymy played a large part. He gives typical examples of the preaching of the time. He names a preacher who spent an entire year discoursing on Christ as a true handicraftsman. In special sermons he described Christ as the best cloth-maker (Matt. 6:25), as the best lamp-maker (Luke 2:47), as the best chimney-sweep. Another in preaching on Christ as a chimney-sweep, described first the chimey-sweep, then, the flue, then, the broom. Kahnis says expressly ''that the learned formalism corresponded, as might be supposed, to the learned content. They quoted the text in Hebrew and Greek, employed much Latin, appealed not only to ancient and mediaeval church teachers, but also to the classics and to the Rabbis, entered into historical and chronological investigations, and thundered not only against Catholics and Reformed, Socinians *et al.*, but also against the Macedonians, Patripassians and Valentinians, and introduced from nature and history many illustrations in which the power to prove and to edify is more than doubtful. Andrew Schoppius preached (1605) a sermon on the origin of the human hair, its proper use and abuse, and in another sermon he stormed against the tobacco-brothers and the tobacco-sisters who chew and smoke the accursed weed, and instead of the morning prayers, bring an offering to the devil, who is their God.'' †

Christlieb and M. Schian, in describing ''the preaching of the Protestant orthodoxy up to the time of Spener (about 1580 to 1700),'' say: ''In general. The post-reformation preaching of the sixteenth, and still more rigidly the Lutheran preaching of the seventeenth century, preserved for about a century and a half its confessional character. Instead of the fresh, quickening attestation of the Reformation period, there prevailed a dry dogmatism, which on the pulpit presented not simply that which is necessary to salvation, but aimed to defend the Confession in the most extreme points of doctrine. The numerous doctrinal

* *Der Geist der Lutherischen Theologen*, p. 70.
† *Der Innere Gang des Deutschen Protestantismus*, pp. 107 *et seqq.*

controversies brought also to the pulpit a harsh polemic. And as more and more by controversy with the Roman and the internal opponents the Church doctrine became a new scholasticism, and in the Church's practice the 'pure doctrine' was regarded as an end in itself, the more did controversies and learned technical terms also enter into the preaching. In its substance it was far more theological than religious, and hence it became at the same time dry and doctrinaire. For the history of preaching a distinction must be made. In the sixteenth century the dry, scholastic doctrinarianism on the pulpit is yet relatively rare. With the most distinguished preachers there yet prevailed for the most part wisely edifying, practical preaching, which comes from the depth of a quiet, firm conviction of faith. On the contrary, at the end of this century, and in the course of the seventeenth, a dry, polemical, and scholastic, ossified preaching gains the ascendency. And yet a mystic, edifying and practical ascetic preaching of faith, even of a churchly character, constantly makes its appearance." *

These authors also give typical examples of subjects and plans of sermons to illustrate the kind of preaching they have described. We must say that in grotesqueness and in monstrousness they put to shame the homiletical vagaries and eccentricities that sometimes degrade and disgrace the pulpit of modern times. Hence we are not surprised to learn "that the churches were turned into beer saloons and into theatres. Yea, we read that during the public worship men got drunk, and that misdemeanors were committed such as cannot be named." † The gluttony, drunkenness and buffoonery of the nobility in that century almost beggar description: "Among them fornication was no sin, much less a disgrace. The same was true of citizens and peasants at the yearly markets, and church festivals; yea, Sundays were spent in dancing and carousing, while fighting, murder and manslaughter were of ordinary occurrence. Many preachers even led disorderly lives and were given to drunkenness. The common people lived in gross ignorance and blindness, and nobody thought about catechetical examinations and instructions." ‡ Indeed, Gerber describes all classes as living almost brutish lives, and quotes John Arndt as having written to a friend: "Ah, my dear Doctor, if we do not declaim against the wicked-

* *Realencyclopädie,*[3] Art., *Predigt.* Lentz, *Geschichte der Christlichen Homiletik,* II., 83-91.

† Kahnis, *ut supra,* p. 115.

‡ Gerber, *Historie der Kirchen-Ceremonien in Sachsen,* pp. 41-42.

ness which is now so great that it mounts to heaven and cries aloud, either a bloody and consuming deluge, or the fire of Sodom or the famine of Samaria and Jerusalem will come upon it."

And yet the historians of the pulpit gladly recognize in the midst of this scholastic doctrinairism and moral degradation the presence of men like John Arndt, Valerius Herberger, Valentine Andreae, Lütkemann, Heinrich Müller and Christian Scriver, preachers of a truly evangelical character, who, in the face of opposition and of denunciation by their colleagues and by the professors of the universities, reproduced the Christian simplicity and the earnest witness of the period of the Reformation, and testified to the life that still existed here and there in the Church and that has always existed in it. But these men were hounded and persecuted by not a few of their contemporaries. John Arndt's *True Christianity* was violently attacked by his brethren in the ministry and was called "a book of hell," and he himself was denounced as a papist, a Pelagian, a Weigelian, a Schwenckfeldian, a mystic. Johannes Deutschmann, as the mouthpiece of the Wittenberg theological faculty, charged two hundred and eighty-four heresies against Philip Jacob Spener. Indeed, almost every form and statement of teaching that differed even in microscopic proportions from the current interpretation of the Symbolical Books was branded as a heresy by the dogmatists and doctrinaires of the time, who thought that the "pure doctrine" could of itself preserve the Church, and if presented by an orthodox ministry would of itself work in those who heard it faith and salvation. Hence the "theology of the unregenerate," or the principle of the *opus operatum* set up in the Lutheran Church, which in some instances was interpreted to mean that the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments by an unregenerate but orthodox pastor would be even more efficacious than if administered by a godly pastor, for in that case there could be no thought of trust in the human merit or worthiness of the minister.

6. *The Dogmatic Theology of the Seventeenth Century.*

But now let us come to the theology of the seventeenth century. It is usually called the Lutheran Dogmatic. Sometimes it is called the Lutheran orthodoxy. It cannot be denied that this theology, taken as a whole, must be regarded as one of the greatest achievements of the human mind. Neither can it be denied that it still has much more than a historical value for

the Lutheran Church; and as little can it be denied that it is not the final theology of the Lutheran Church or for the Lutheran Church. If theology be a science, then, like every other science, it must hold fast to that which has been established, and it must appropriate by truly scientific process all that can be established by subsequent study and research; and it must give up all that improper methods and false deductions have imposed upon it.

That some of the methods employed by the Lutheran Dogmaticians of the seventeenth century were improper and unscientific will not be questioned. Notwithstanding the confessional declaration that the Holy Scripture is the only rule of faith and doctrine, it is nevertheless a fact that Holy Scripture received very little critical and scientific study during the dogmatic era. It was assumed that "all Scripture" was inspired, not only in thought, but in word, in letter and in Hebrew vowel point. Differences in time, in circumstances, in authors, were but little, if at all, regarded. Hence one portion of the Bible was just as authoritative as another, and was just as appropriate for the confirmation of doctrine as another, provided it be accepted according to the interpretation which had been given it in the Symbolical Books. Thus, in reality the Symbolical Books became the norm of doctrine. They, too, were regarded as inspired—not *immediately*, not in their words and letters, but *mediately* and in their content. Leonhard Hutter, Johannes Deutschmann and others regarded the Formula of Concord as *theopneustic*. Gottlieb Wernsdorf, in his *Dissertation on the Authority of the Symbolical Books,* affirms that they are free from all errors, and that they agree perfectly with Holy Scripture; nor do they contain even any accidental errors. Samuel Schelwig, in his *Synopsis of Controversies*, affirmed without qualification that the Symbolical Books are free from errors. He gives as the reasons for his conviction that they repeat the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures; that the Holy Spirit guides the Church into all truth; that Christ, in fulfillment of His promise, John 16:13, was present and imparted such divine grace to the authors of the Symbolical Books that they were unable to err. Walch says that Wernsdorf "distinctly affirms that the Symbolical Books are not merely human productions, but also entirely divine, since the Books are to be estimated more from their matter, the nobler part, than from the external form and manner of statement, which are subordinate. Hence the Symbols merit the name and

title of divine much rather than of human productions." * Walch gives the names of others who held similar views in regard to the inspired character of the Symbolical Books, and says that "very many are wont to say simply that these Books are divine, but do not explain in what manner divineness is to be understood, and wherein it differs from the divineness of Holy Scripture." J. B. Carpzov (1607-1657) wrote: "The Symbolical Books are not primarily *theopneustic,* but only sacred, and in a secondary sense divine, and only with reference to the object, which is divine revelation, and by no means with reference to the mode of communication, which is human, and has the privilege of only mediate illumination." † But the Wittenberg theological faculty declared officially in 1695: "We believe, teach and confess that the Symbolical Books, not only in matter and in doctrines, *but also* in *all the parts, are* the divine truth imparted to the Church according to the Scriptures, and are obligatory in all points." ‡

And as regards the formula of obligation laid upon candidates for the ministry at their ordination, we find that it was absolute and unequalified. Some theologians regarded subscription qualified by *quatenus* as equivalent to subscription to the Racovian Catechism or to the Alcoran.§ Hutter informs us that candidates for the ministry subscribed the Formula of Concord *puré* and *categoricé;* and he has handed down to us a formula of subscription which was introduced in 1602: "I, N. N., solemnly promise, that I will not depart from the Prophetical and Apostolical doctrine as it is contained in sum in the articles of the Augsburg Confession, in the *Formula of Concord,* and is implied in the Church statement of our Prince, the Elector, nor from the doctrine of our churches, especially as it treats of the human powers, of justification, of the Supper of the Lord, of Baptism, of the person of Christ, nor from its other articles. I will not teach contrary to these, nor assent to the corruptions, sects, opinions and errors of the Sacramen-

* *Introductio,* pp. 930-931. See also Höfling, *De Symbolorum Natura,* etc., for similar instances of judgment in regard to the inspiration and inerrancy of the Symbolical Books. Presented with fulness by Heinrich Schmid in *Die Geschichte des Pietismus,* Cap. V.: Die Einzelangriffe auf Spener von Schelwig, Carpzov, Alberti, der Wittenberger Fakultät.

† *Isagoge in Lib. Luth. Symbolicos,* p. 3.

‡ Quoted from Höfling, *ut supra,* p. 45, *note.* Also quoted by Schmid, *Geschichte des Pietismus,* p. 244.

§ Walch, *Introductio,* pp. 962 *et seqq.;* Höfling, *ut supra,* p. 72.

tarians and others, nor will I introduce anything new, nor will I change anything." *

It will be seen that the servants of the Church were bound hand and foot to the Symbolical Books. In the formula quoted from Hutter, the Scriptures are not even named—only the Prophetical and Apostolical doctrine as the same is contained in the Augsburg Confession and in the *Formula of Concord.* The Confessions are the norm. From their statement of doctrine there can be no deviation, while the italics and the capitals used show the points of emphasis, namely, the *Formula of Concord,* the Supper of the LORD and the person of CHRIST.

7. *The Dogmaticians.*

Now it was under such conditions and restrictions that the Lutheran Dogmatic arose.† We begin with Leonhard Hutter (1563-1616), from 1596 Professor of Polemics at Wittenberg, called *Lutherus Redivivus* and *Malleus Calvinianorum,* the learned and valiant defender of the Lutheran Symbols, and the author of *Concordia Concors* against *Concordia Discors* of Hospinian. In 1610 Hutter, under commission of the Elector Christian II., published a *Compendium of theological Common Places drawn from the Holy Scripture and the Book of Concord.* The different topics are presented in the form of questions and answers. For the most part the answers are given in the words of the Formula of Concord, though quotations are made from the writings of Luther, Chemnitz, Aegidius Hunnius, and even from those of Melanchthon, though in the Preface the author creates prejudice against Melanchthon by attaching to his name this note: Ubiquidem *orthodoxiam* ille tenuit!

This book was introduced into the provincial schools and universities by command of the Elector, and had to be committed to memory by the students. It supplanted Melanchthon's *Loci,* which for three generations had been voluntarily used as the principal text-book in theology,‡ and it made the

* *Concordia Concors,* Cap. LVI., fol. 380*b*.

† It would be scarcely possible to fix the date of the rise of the scholastic theology of the Lutheran Church. Even David Chytraeus (died 1600) confessed that in his time theology was mere scholastica, in qua nihil pietatis appareat. See Möller-Kawerau, *Kirchengeschichte,* 3d ed., III., 411 *et seqq.,* for an excellent treatment of the subject.

‡ In the year 1588, the Elector Christian I. of Saxony commanded that Dr. Heinrich Mai should lecture publicly on Melanchthon's *Loci* before the students in the University of Wittenberg, and should pursue the matter with all diligence. Original in Förstemann's *Liber Decanorum,* p. 165.

definitions of the Symbolical Books, rather than the Holy Scriptures, normative for Lutheran theology. Hence it marks a turning point in the history of the Lutheran theology; indeed, strictly speaking, it introduced the Lutheran Dogmatic in its characteristic features. The answers to the questions on the person and work of Christ, on Free-will, on the Lord's Supper, are taken prevailingly from the Formula of Concord, or are supported by references to the same.

Hutter's method was more fully carried out in his *Loci Communes Theologici,* published by the Wittenberg Theological Faculty in 1619. This work is professedly based on the *Loci Communes* of Melanchthon. But it begins with an attack on Melanchthon, and sets forth seven fundamental points in which Melanchthon departed from the orthodoxy of Luther; and then, at the close of the section, it is said: "As regards the person and death of Philip, it is not ours to judge. He was the servant of Christ; to this his own Master he both has stood and has fallen. And though we neither can nor ought to praise in him the defection from the purity of the heavenly doctrine, yet we do not doubt that at the close of his life he earnestly repented and sought and obtained from Christ the Saviour the pardon of this sin also."

Nothing can better exhibit the spirit of the old *orthodoxy* than this quotation. It makes salvation depend upon the faith that *is believed,* rather than upon the faith that *believes.*

We come next to John Gerhard (1582-1637), Superintendent at Heldburg, Professor at Jena, General Superintendent at Coburg, who has been called the "archtheologian." His *Loci Communes Theologici* appeared in nine volumes at Jena in 1620-1622. Though he followed the *local* or topical method, yet he is far more thorough, comprehensive and systematic than Hutter. In an eminent degree he combines learning, piety, orthodoxy and mysticism, and makes commendable use of exegesis. Nevertheless, his tendency is scholastic. He divides and subdivides; refutes those of an opposing faith, argues by thesis and antithesis; quotes extensively from the ancient teachers of the Church, and employs many technical terms borrowed from the Greeks and the Mediaevals. Reason and the understanding occupy a prominent place in Gerhard's theology, which is still regarded as a classic in the Lutheran Church, notwithstanding the fact that it carries the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scripture to the Hebrew vowel points. Buddeus has this to

say: "Our John Gerhard has dimmed the glory of almost all those who have published systems or *loci communes theologici.* There are some who accuse him of having brought back the scholastic theology into our Church, as is evident from his *Loci Theologici,* which are treated in a scholastic way. Nevertheless, these same persons must confess that he was more cautious than those who followed him, and was more moderate in combining philosophy with theology." *

Abraham Calovius (1612-1686), from 1650 Professor at Wittenberg, who prayed daily: *Reple me, Deus, odio haereticorum,* published, 1655-1677, his *Systema Locorum Theologicorum* in twelve thick quarto volumes. He has been called a dogmatic virtuoso, the Lutheran Torquemada, and has been compared to a stone-mason who cuts and hews stones for a wall. His method is the analytico-causal, and advances through proof and refutation to the practical use of the doctrine. Calovius and his *Systema* have been thus described by Gass: "The careful treatment of Bible passages and the patristic citations alternate, and the polemic vehemence is even more tolerable than the lifeless aridity of the compends. The true sense for truth and the echoing tone of hearty piety which meet us in Gerhard we seek in vain in Calovius, and it cannot exist when the attention is so strained in detecting the foreign and the contradictory, and has the effect now of chilling and now of exciting in the presentation. The entire tendency is different, or rather, it now truly becomes a tendency. Every other didactic purpose is dominated by that of maintaining the system amid invading distractions, just as in the times of the Formula of Concord." † Faith was with him in its ultimate ground the reception of the orthodox doctrine, and all articles are essential. He says expressly: "*Fides est una copulativa;* so that if any one denies or removes anything in the system of faith, he destroys the entire system of faith." And again: "Not only must faith be retained and guarded in those articles which concern the foundation, but also in the others, that are placed above, or beneath, or are joined to the foundation." ‡

John Andrew Quenstedt (1617-1688), since 1649 Professor of Theology at Wittenberg, called "the bookkeeper of the Wittenberg orthodoxy," published in 1685 his *Theologia Didactico-*

* *Isagoge Historico-Theologica,* pp. 391-2.
† *Geschichte der Protestantischen Dogmatik,* I., pp. 333-4.
‡ *Tomus Primus,* pp. 797-799. See a good sketch of Calovius in Tholuck's *Der Geist der Luth. Theologen,* pp. 185-210.

Polemica, which is regarded as the last comprehensive system of the old Lutheran dogmatic. It is based essentially on König's *Compend* and presents nothing that is new or original. "Through objectivity of statement and through large acquaintance with the contemporaneous literature, Quenstedt, next to Gerhard, is the most instructive representative of the orthodox dogmaticians. But formalism is overdone. Theology has become a mathematic of dogmatic ideas. The Scriptures are subordinate, rather than authoritative." *

Hafenreffer, König, Baier, Scherzer and Hollazius might be added to the list of Lutheran Dogmaticians; but these four, namely, Hutter, Gerhard, Calovius and Quenstedt, may be regarded as the best representatives of the orthodox Dogmatic of the seventeenth century, which has been characterized thus by Luthardt: "The Dogmatic of the seventeenth century (with the close of the sixteenth) will always remain the classic age of the Lutheran Dogmatic, and it is the necessary school of all that follow. Yet it is not without its shadowy sides. 1. The preponderance of polemic occasioned by the necessary conflict with Synergism, Crypto-Calvinism and Syncretism at home, as well as with the cunningly renewed attacks of the Romish Church, that is, of Bellarmin, and against the Arminians, the Socinians, and sects from without. 2. A too exclusive subservience to the *Symbols,* to which already Hutter (Explan. libri conc., p. 1) ascribed a certain divine inspiration (Librum conc. divinitus inspiratum appellare minime dubitamus), by which Dogmatic became a scholasticism. With this is connected, 3., the formalistic character and unhistorical mind. The devotion to form, that is, the causal method (causa efficiens, materialis, formalis, finalis), or the defining method (analysis of the definitions placed at the beginning), or the two united, at first employed for mastering and curtailing the material, finally made the scientific presentation external and destitute of life. Instead of the historical treatment, *logic* ruled in a one-sided way." †

The Reformation was a movement characterized by *productivity,* and by an intense *subjectivity,* in the sense that the Reformers laid stress on the *experience* of salvation, and on *the faith that believes.* The orthodoxy of the last quarter of

* Luthardt, *Kompendium der Dogmatik,* 7th ed., p. 52.

† *Kompendium der Dogmatik,* p. 47. See Frank, *Geschichte und Kritik der Neueren Theologie,* pp. 21 *et seqq.*

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

the sixteenth and of the seventeenth century was characterized by *reproduction, systemization, incrustation, ossification,* and by an intense *objectivity,* in the sense that it laid stress on *the faith that is believed.* It aimed to guard the treasure that had been bequeathed as a quantum of doctrine, rather than to add to it and to apply it for the procurement of practical results.

Moreover, this Dogmatic, especially that of the seventeenth century, must be characterized chiefly as a *polemic,* that is, it was directed chiefly by the polemical spirit, and proceeds on the principle that the true doctrine can be established only by refuting the opposite doctrine. Hence, as a rule, the Catholics, the Calvinists, the Socinians, the Syncretists, the Weigeleans, the Mystics, and others are brought on the arena and dialectically slain and cast out. Even a superficial acquaintance with Calovius and Quenstedt shows us this characteristic, but this need not surprise us. It comes as a legitimate inheritance from the Formula of Concord and from the Flacianist Polemic.

7. *The Syncretistic Controversy.*

This sketch of the Dogmatic of the seventeenth century would be quite incomplete, did it not contain some account of the Syncretistic Controversy.

It will be recalled that the University of Helmstädt did not accept the Book of Concord. Here, in the seventeenth century, the learned George Calixtus was the most active and influential professor. He was not bound in his teaching by the Book of Concord. He thought to unite all Christians on the basis of the Scriptures and the doctrinal tradition of the first five centuries (*consensus quinquesaecularis*). This, and his *Epitome Theologiae,* first published in 1619, brought him into conflict with other Lutheran theologians. Especially was he hated and suspected because he spoke well of the Reformed and opposed the doctrine of ubiquity. He himself proposed the name Syncretism. Eventually the Syncretistic Controversy, as it here concerns us, was between Wittenberg and Helmstädt, or more specifically, between Calovius and Calixtus. The former violently attacked the latter in different treatises, and the latter replied just as violently, utterly repudiating the allegations that he had overthrown the foundations of the Evangelical Confession. In his repudiation he was entirely correct, for it cannot be shown that Calixtus ever departed from the generic Lutheran doctrine. In his *Epitome Theologiae,* p. 208, he says that, when "the conse-

crated bread is received and eaten, at the same time the true substantial body of Christ is received and eaten, and when the consecrated cup is received and drunk, at the same time the true substantial blood of Christ is received and drunk." In his Christology he is as thoroughly orthodox as is Chemnitz in his *Two Natures of Christ,* and in his Anthropology there is not a trace of Pelagianism or of false Synergism. His sin was that he did not express himself according to the conceptions and in the language of the then current orthodoxy.

Solomon Glassius, Professor at Jena, and then General Superintendent at Gotha, who enjoyed the highest reputation for learning and for soundness in the Lutheran faith, was directed by his Prince to publish an opinion on the Syncretistic Controversy. In this "he demonstrated with equal impartiality and thoroughness that the disputed points were unimportant, and that the erroneous doctrines with which Calixtus was charged were, at most, only indiscreet expressions." *

Finally, in the year 1655, the Wittenberg theological Faculty prepared in eighty-eight articles, the *Consensus Repetitus Fidei vere Lutheranae,* which, both in character and in contents, may be regarded as the logical conclusion of the orthodox Dogmatic of the seventeenth century.† It is aimed expressly at the teaching of Calixtus. Its character, at least in part, may be judged when it is learned that its authors "profess and teach that the article of the Most Holy Trinity is most firmly established in the Books of the Old Testament, since these not only teach that there are three persons of the most Holy Trinity, but also most incontestably add that there is one true God, and that that one God, together with God the Father, is also the Son of God and God the Holy Spirit"; that "divine and infinite attributes (according to the testimony of Scripture) have been given and communicated to Christ the man"; that in baptism little in-

* Gieseler, V. See *Unschuldige Nachrichten,* 1732, pp. 486-7, and *idem,* 1738, p. 41 *et seqq.* Since writing the text above we have discovered this judgment by Professor Kawerau: "With a few Melanchthonian modifications of the orthodox Dogmatic, he (Calixtus) held fast to the Lutheran doctrine, but Catholics and Reformed and Lutherans should recognize that *in the substance of faith common* to them they possess *that which is essential.*" *Kirchengeschichte,* 3d ed., III., 432. Without question this may be regarded as a correct statement of the position of Calixtus.

† Buddeus reports that the *Consensus Repetitus* was composed by Calovius in the name of the Wittenberg and Leipzig theologians, and was published in 1666. *Isagoge,* p. 1418. The Preface, written by Calovius, is dated January, 1666. But the book itself was prepared ten years earlier. The Latin text was republished by Henke, Marburg, 1847. Published both in Latin and in German in *Concilia Theologica Witebergensia,* pp. 928 *et seqq.*

fants are given the Holy Spirit, are sanctified, and made acceptable to God, "and that, through their own actual faith"; that no one can be saved, in whatever dispensation he may have lived or shall yet live, who does not believe in and hold the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; that "the will of man in conversion and justification is absolutely passive"; and those are rejected "who teach that not only Lutherans and Greeks, but also Papists and Calvinists belong to the Christian Church."

The *Consensus* was subscribed by the theologians of Wittenberg and Leipzig. Their object was to have it subscribed by all the universities as a new Symbolical book.* But already the violently polemical and magisterial spirit of the Wittenberg theologians had excited disgust and opposition. Tübingen had not forgotten the attitude of Wittenberg in the Krypto-Kenosis Controversy, and Jena, under the judicious leadership of John Musaeus, had conceived a pacific spirit. Musaeus, supported by his colleagues, not only denied the charges made by Wittenberg against Jena, but followed the denial with a scathing review of the *Consensus.* Also several Princes, after the peace of Westphalia, showed themselves averse to the new controversies that had sprung up. It was seen that a creed so dogmatic, illiberal, abounding in exaggerated and malicious allusions, could only produce additional strife and alienation. Hence the *Consensus Repetitus* failed to receive confessional endorsement, and with this failure, the Lutheran Orthodoxy, which had now become *orthodoxism*, and the Lutheran Dogmatic, which had now become dogmatism, soon began to decline under its own weight. A new spirit had entered, and it was felt that the religious life of the German people needed a nourishment different from that offered by the *Consensus Repetitus.*†

* Buddeus, *ut supra,* p. 1, 428; Gieseler, V., p. 273.

† Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica Selecta,* II., 681, and Walch, *Streitigkeiten,* 4 and 5, p. 828; Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology.,* II., 197-8. Tholuck, *Der Geist,* etc., 185-210, *passim.*

CHAPTER XXX.

THE SYMBOLICAL BOOKS IN THE ERA OF PIETISM, OF PHILOSOPHY AND OF RATIONALISM.

THE moral and religious condition of Germany during the last half of the sixteenth and the whole of the seventeenth century, as made known by the most reliable historians, was simply appalling. Almost every vice and crime of which human beings are capable ran riot. John George Walch has described the condition as follows: "In all classes godlessness had gained the upper hand: pomp, luxury, intemperance, injustice, falsehood, were in full swing. The grossest sins were no longer regarded as sin: sometimes the people lived worse than the heathen had done, and thus we find few traces of a real and true Christianity. For the most part the people clung to the externals and thought that it was sufficient if a person was a Christian in externals, and outwardly confessed himself to the Lutheran Church, had been baptized in it, and at stated times went to the confessional and to the Lord's Supper. This preconception which is found in people arises from many external causes, which exist and operate in all classes. Thus whoever regarded the matter with spiritual eyes cannot but say that our Church, in reference to the life and walk of our Christians, was in a highly corrupt condition." *

That the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) aggravated the wretched moral and religious conditions of the German people, is undoubtedly true. But the chief responsibility lies with the controversies and with the theology of the times that preceded the war, and with the preachers and pastors of the seventeenth century. Gustav Freytag, in his *Pictures of the German Olden Times*, has praised the zeal of the country pastor and the village preacher, but he adds: "If we dare make one class responsible for the defects of the picture, which it did not create, but only represented, then have the Lutheran ministers a heavy and fatal guilt in the desolation of soul, in the impractical weakness,

* *Einleitung in die Streitigkeiten,* II., 715-16. For confirmation see Spener, *passim;* Gerber, *ut supra,* pp. 40-43; Schlegel, *Reformationsgeschichte von Nord Deutschland,* II., *passim;* Tholuck, *Das Kirchliche Leben des 17. Jahrhunderts; Würtembergische Kirchengeschichte,* pp. 449 *et seqq.*

in the dry and tedious formalism, which so often manifested themselves in the German life at the end of the sixteenth century. The ministers, as a class, were neither acceptable, nor especially amiable, and even their morality was narrow-minded and inhuman."

The *Würtembergische Kirchengeschichte* testifies that the sources of information more than justify Freytag's picture, both as to the praise he bestows upon the village pastors and as "to the evil effect of the wretched times upon the official and domestic life of many a preacher." * But it was not all bad in Germany. There were still more than seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal and had not kissed his image; and there were prophets of God in those days who rebuked sin in high places and in low, but these were only as the voices of men crying in the wilderness, one here and one yonder. The godly village pastors sowed and watered and preserved seed in the earth: while Sebastian Schmidt and John Konrad Dannhauer of Strassburg were training up a plant that should spread its benign influence over Germany from the South to the North.

1. *Pietism. What it is.*

Pietism, as it concerns us in this chapter, has to do primarily and fundamentally with Philip Jacob Spener and his efforts to awaken deeper spiritual life in the Lutheran Church of Germany. He was born in Rappoldsweiler, in Upper Alsace, January 13, 1635. He was by nature deeply religious, and very early in life he read important books on practical piety. At the University of Strassburg Sebastian Schmidt awoke in him a great interest in the exegesis of the Holy Scriptures, and Dannhauer directed him to the writings of Luther, and created in him that love for the Lutheran doctrine and that respect for the order of the Lutheran Church, which in later years saved him from the separatistic movements of sectarianism. At the conclusion of his academic career he went to Basel, where he studied Hebrew under the younger Buxtorf, and thence to Geneva, where he was deeply impressed by the excellent discipline in the Church and by the earnest religious life of the people, and where he learned to know the highly gifted and spiritually minded John Labadie. But he was not so much influenced by these associations as not to be able, in the year 1666, to preach and to publish a sermon against the Reformed. So deeply had he become

* Pp. 439-440.

grounded in the Lutheran doctrine that he preached it to the end of his days, preferred it to the doctrine of any other church, confessed it, and manifested impatience with Lutherans who scrupled to subscribe to the Symbolical Books, though he did not concede that such Books are inspired, neither did he extend subscription to all their sharp points.*

After returning from Switzerland to Germany Spener received, but declined, a call to a theological professorship in the University of Tübingen. In 1663 he accepted a call to become pastor in Strassburg, and lectured in the University on history and philosophy in 1666; at the age of thirty-one, he accepted a call to become pastor and senior of the ministerium in Frankfort on the Main. Here it was that Spener began really to be active as a reformer of the church life of his time, and here it was that the epithet *Pietism* was first applied to his work. He did not begin by proclaiming a theory of reformation, nor did he depart from the methods sanctioned by the Church, nor did he renounce a single principle established by the Reformation. He began at once to operate on the moral and spiritual conditions of the people as they were exhibited in Frankfort. As the government of the Church was in the hands of civil counsellors, church discipline was well-nigh, if not absolutely, impossible. But the way lay open to catechize the young and to instruct the people in the Scriptures. Activity along such lines was in entire harmony with the principles of the Reformation, which had bequeathed the Catechism to the Church and had restored the Scriptures to the people. His entire future course is outlined by the following passage delivered in a sermon on the seventeenth Sunday after Trinity in the year 1669:

"Oh, how much benefit would result if sometimes on Sunday good friends would come together, and, instead of beer and cards and dice, would either take in hand a book and read something for the edification of all, or would repeat something from the sermons which they hear, and if they would all speak, each with the other, about the divine mysteries, and if he to whom God has given more would try to instruct his weaker brethren! But where they are not clear in their own minds they might consult a preacher and have the matter explained. Ah, should this be done, how wickedness would disappear everywhere! Then the Holy Sunday would be hallowed in a way that would

* See *Bedenken*, I., 39, 40, 341-394, 597, and III., 972; *Sermon*, Sexagesima Sunday, 1697; *Concilia*, I., 331.

bring great edification and marked benefit. Moreover, it is certain that we preachers cannot instruct the people from the pulpit to the extent that it ought to be done, where there are not also others of the congregation who by divine grace better understand Christianity by virtue of the universal Christian ministry, and who with us should study to do good to their neighbor according to the measure of their gifts." This suggestion soon developed into the *collegia pietatis,* or assemblies for the study of the Scriptures and of books of edification, and for conference on the sermon of the previous Sunday.

In the year 1675 an edition of John Arndt's *Postils* was published in Frankfort with a Preface by Philip Jacob Spener. Here we have his *Pia Desideria or Hearty Longing for a God-pleasing Improvement in the Evangelical Church, together with some Christian Suggestions looking to that End.* He begins by giving a description of the wretched condition of the Church: The rulers for the most part serve their own lusts, perpetuate their caesaropapism, and stand in the way of the ministers. The clergy is totally corrupt. They are destitute of the spirit of self-denial. Theology is essentially a science of controversy. The common people are given to drunkenness, lawsuits, claiming absolution without repentance. The picture of the moral and religious condition of the people is drawn in very dark colors. Then comes the propositions for improvement.

1. That the Word of God be more fruitfully brought to the people than had been previously done, and than was possible to be done where the preachers were confined to the Perikopes. In every household the Bible should be read every day, and in certain seasons the books of the Bible should be read in order in the Church without explanation. As was done in the times of the Apostles, so in addition to the public worship in the churches, meetings should be held for the reading and explanation of the Scriptures and for mutual edification.

2. The establishment and the diligent practice of the spiritual priesthood. Christ constituted all believers priests. The spiritual offices belong to all Christians without distinction, though the public administration belongs to the clergy. It was a trick of the devil that under the Papacy all the spiritual offices were usurped by the *clerici.* In opposition to this monopoly of the spiritual office, which belongs to all Christians, it is the duty of every Christian to instruct, to admonish, to edify his brother. By the orderly use of this spiritual priesthood the regular

ministry is supplemented and assisted. Thus the entire Church will be benefited.

3. It must be impressed on the laity that in Christianity it is not enough simply to know, but that the chief thing consists of practice.

4. In conducting religious controversies and in intercourse with unbelievers and with false believers there should be prayer, good example and the statement of the error without abuse and personal allegations. Controversy is necessary for the removal of error, but not all controversy is either profitable or good; and if the disputants act without the Holy Spirit and without faith they often bring strange fire into the sanctuary of the Lord. Often the disputants contend more for glory and for victory than for the establishment of the truth.

5. The training of the ministers in the universities must be changed. "The disorderly academic life should be abated, and the universities should cease to be the devil's workshop for ambition, drunkenness, fighting and quarreling." The students on departing from the universities ought to bring with them testimonials, not only of talents and diligence, but also of godly lives. The professors should direct the studies of the students with reference to their talents and to their distinction in life. Controversy should be curtailed, and students should be directed to such writings as the *German Theology* and to the works of Tauler and Thomas a Kempis. And since theology is a *habitus practicus,* students should have such practical lectures on the New Testament as would qualify them to instruct and to comfort the sick.

6. There should be a complete change in the style of preaching. Instead of displaying learning, employing foreign languages, artificial arrangement and rhetoric, it should be directed to the inner man.

It will thus be seen that Spener was Lutheran through and through. There is not one of these *Desideria* that is not in perfect harmony with genuine Lutheranism. As his preaching and many of his discussions show, Spener in seeking to realize these *Desideria* emphasized all the Lutheran doctrines. His frequent expositions of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper and of justification are solidly Lutheran, though, as was natural under the circumstances, he insisted more than Luther did on the fruits of justification, or on the practice of a truly Christian life. He held that the Reformation had not been completed, but that it

must be carried further. Luther he regarded as a giant, but he declares that a pigmy standing on the shoulders of a giant can see further than the giant.

Luther would have hailed Spener as a man after his own heart, and as a true soldier of Jesus Christ, who was fighting in Frankfort essentially the same battle that he himself had fought at Wittenberg a century and a half earlier. Did Luther fight against the Pontifex Maximus of Rome? Spener was fighting against the arrogant "little popes" scattered all over Germany. Did Luther fight against an ignorant and corrupt priesthood? Spener was fighting against an inept and immoral clergy. Did Luther fight against false doctrine? Spener was fighting against the false application of doctrine. The battle in both cases was a struggle for a living faith as over against dead formalism, and the weapons used by both were the same, namely, the preaching and the teaching of the Word of God. Spener, not less than Luther, aimed at the regeneration of theology, the purification of the Church, the reformation of the mode of life among Christians, that is, among those who professed to be Christians.

The Lutheran Theology in the time of Spener might have been allowed to pass as "the pure doctrine;" but it was deficient of life, and was associated with the pernicious principle of the *theologia irregenitorum*. In the main it was a cold intellectual apprehension of revealed truth almost infinitely divided and subdivided by definitions, thesis and antithesis, syllogisms, proofs and refutations, a scholastic philosophy of religion, and not that *habitus practicus* which comes through the study of the Divine Word under the illumination of the Holy Spirit and by the quickening power of faith. The head, as Spener once expressed it, must be sent down into the heart. The Church must again become a teaching institution. She—not the *clerici*—possesses the Word and the sacraments. It is her duty to use these for the edification of her members and for the purification of the body of Christ. The *clerici* had claimed a monopoly of the office of teaching and of edification, and had gone back virtually to the principle of the *opus operatum*. Whatever was preached from the pulpit was held to be God's Word, and scarcely anyone doubted that he who heard it would receive the divine blessing. Spener sought to arouse the laity to a proper appreciation of their rights and to the discharge of the duties involved in the universal priesthood of believers and to stimulate

faith in those who compose the Church, so that the Church *late dicta* might become the living body of Christ, the Church *proprie dicta*. His supreme aim was the regeneration of the ethical and religious life of the people in opposition to the mere formalism that satisfied itself by going to the confessional and to the Lord's Supper. He demanded that people should impose restraint upon themselves, and should abstain from dancing, card playing, extravagant dressing, and should cultivate sobriety of speech and conduct.

To the effectuation of these great ends Spener directs all his preaching; and his sermons, which are generally very long, are well adapted to produce reformation in the entire ecclesiastical and religious condition. They are to so high a degree doctrinal and ethical that a system of popular dogmatic and a system of practical ethics might be compiled from them. First comes the *Introduction,* then the *Exposition of the Text,* then the *Points of Doctrine,* and then the *Content of the Gospel.* Such sermons could not possibly produce fanaticism or sentimentalism in religion. Their proper effect would be the production of an intelligent and churchly piety, and such was the actual effect produced by Spener's preaching. Hence we are not surprised to learn that his preaching was received with great applause. Even his *Pia Desideria* were at first approved by the most orthodox theologians of Germany. Abraham Calovius wrote as follows: "Oh, how good and precious it was at that time to many students to be pointed to real improvement, for they were very hungry and thirsty to know how they were to proceed in the paths of reformation, and to attain to true evangelical improvement, and to direct others!" *

But when Spener and his friends began to make a real application of the *Pia Desideria* by turning attention to the study of the Bible as over against the current methods of theological instruction, and restored the universal priesthood in the congregations as over against caesaropapism and the clerical monopoly of the means of grace, and opposed the theology of faith to the *theologia irregenitorum*, then it was that scores upon scores of books and pamphlets and manifestos were launched against "the innovations of Pietism." Nevertheless, Pietism made progress. Soon after coming to Dresden in 1686 Spener induced the Elector to order the two Saxon universities (1690) to introduce exegetical studies, and to conduct the same in such a way

* Schmid, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, p. 61.

as to make them serviceable for consolation and for admonition against sin. The professors were commanded "to finish a chapter in three or four lectures, and not to consume the time with the opinions of the Doctors of the Church, or with other unnecessary and curious matters, but to take the utmost care to bring their hearers to a simple understanding of the Scriptures." *

This was revolutionary, indeed, but it was not an innovation. It was simply a return to the methods of the Reformation, for Luther and Melanchthon placed all emphasis on exegesis, and scarcely taught anything else, especially Luther. Indeed, all things considered, Spener did his most important work in the sphere of education. Rather, it was through education that he most beneficially influenced religion. His essay *On Academic Studies,* dated, Dresden, February 10, 1690, marks the beginning of a new era in theological education, or rather the beginning of a return to the methods of the Reformation. He does not repudiate philosophy as a mental discipline, and he even speaks favorably of the Cartesian philosophy, but he objects to the abuse of philosophy, that is, to the scholastic theology which arose from "a nefarious commingling of the Aristotelian philosophy and Christian theology." He duly recognizes the value and importance of catechetical, polemical, symbolical, moral, historical and homiletical theology, but he lays the supreme stress on exegetical theology, "since the Holy Scriptures are the sole fountain of our faith, from which all theology must be sought. Hence it cannot be denied that it is far more important to be engaged with the fountain than with the stream." But he declares that "mention must be made of the Symbolical Books in which our Church, as regards confession, has distinguished herself from other assemblies. They err who, contrary to the distinct protest of our confessors, make those books in practice equal to the Sacred Books, and who regard it as all one that a thing is found in those and in the Sacred Books. The doctrines of our Symbolical Books have all their truth and certainty, not from those books, but from the words of the Holy Spirit, from which they ought to be drawn." He insists that the Symbolical Books should be studied, but studied in subordination to the Holy Scriptures and with reference to the intention of the fathers.†

With such views on theological education we are not surprised

* *Concilia Latina,* I., 224. † *Concilia Latina,* I., 198 *et seqq.*

to learn that Spener encouraged the *Collegium Philobiblicum* founded in Leipzig by Augustus Hermann Francke, John Kaspar Schade and Paul Anton, and that when this was suppressed, at the instance of the Leipzig theological professors, he induced the Elector of Brandenburg to found the University of Halle, and to invite to its theological chairs Francke and Anton and Joachim Justus Breithaupt.

Pietism now had a university for the training of the ministers of the Church according to the conceptions of Spener. The professors were all men of scientific attainments and they taught theology in a truly scientific manner. They did not neglect Polemics, nor Dogmatics, nor Symbolics, but they emphasized exegesis, and taught a truly evangelical theology as over against the scholastic orthodoxy which still reigned in the other German universities. New controversies arose, but soon hundreds of students were pursuing theological studies at Halle.

2. *The Victory of Pietism.*

The learned and pious Valentine Ernest Loescher, Superintendent at Dresden, the last advocate of the old orthodoxy, attacked the Pietists in a series of essays published in the *Unschuldige Nachrichten.* This is by far the most learned and acute attack ever made on the Pietists. But the author refrained from violence and offensive personalities, thus illustrating Spener's fourth *Desiderium.* He was answered in a violent and insulting manner by Joachim Lange of the Halle theological Faculty. But Loescher showed a disposition to reach an understanding with his opponents, and gradually so modified his views in regard to Pietism as to be able to say to a Moravian congregation, in 1736: "You are a God-fearing congregation. Do not be proud, but faithful. You have the pure doctrine as we have, only we do not have your order of government."

David Hollazius (1648-1713), sometimes spoken of as the last of the dogmaticians, was true to the Lutheran doctrines, but he was influenced both by Syncretism and by Pietism. He treats Syncretism very mildly, and does not even mention Pietism in his work on Theology. But he reproduces Spener's conception of a theologian: "A true theologian cultivates piety in his whole heart without guile." "In a general sense a man who is skilled in theological knowledge is called a theologian." "In a *special* and *more excellent sense* the regenerate man is called a theologian."*

* P. 14. See Gass, *ut supra,* II., 497.

John Francis Buddeus (1667-1729) belongs to an entirely new era, in which we see no more the dominancy of the old orthodoxy. In his *Institutio Theologiae Dogmaticae*, five books published in 1724, he states the Lutheran doctrines firmly, but moderately, places theology on a scriptural basis and is sparing in the use of scholastic terms. He says nothing about the ubiquity of the human nature of Christ. Syncretism is only mildly opposed. The teaching on the sacrament has not the tone of the dogmatic era. Stress is laid on Luther's *Oratio, Meditatio, Tentatio*, "from which it follows that only he can justly and properly be called a theologian who is endued with true faith, or is regenerate." * With him the end of theology was the practice of faith and living the Christian life. He lived on better terms with Spener, and was better satisfied with Zinzendorf than with Cyprian and Loescher. In his brief literary account of the Pietistic Controversy he shows decided sympathy for Spener.

John George Walch (1693-1775), Buddeus' son-in-law, Professor at Jena from 1718, shows still more sympathy with Pietism than Buddeus did.† In Meusel's Hand Lexicon he is described as a "theologian who, mediating between Orthodoxy and Pietism, held fast to the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, but declared that true piety is the supreme end of all theology and the greatest ornament of the theologian. He also united extraordinary learning with sincere piety."

In the year 1750 he issued an edition of the Symbolical Books, German and Latin, with an Introduction. He holds expressly with Spener that the Symbolical Books are not inspired, says that symbolical books are only hypothetically necessary, that not all Lutheran congregations accept all the Lutheran Symbolical Books, that "one is preferred to the other and has greater authority;" that it is undeniable that the Symbolical Books contain errors, such as spurious quotations, the misunderstanding and false application of passages of Scripture, as Rom. 14: 23; Zach. 1: 12; Ezek. 20: 25; "as also some expressions are used which seem questionable, and especially do they seem to favor the papists." He holds that the Symbolical Books are authoritative "in points of faith." Of subscription he says expressly: "The obligation extends to the doctrine and to the truths that have been drawn from the Scriptures, but not to the secondary matters which have to do with the diction, the arrangement, the expressions, the testimonies explained, and the

* P. 60.

† *Religionsstreitigkeiten*, 4 and 5, pp. 1030 *et seqq.*

like, which they contain. The doctrines can be regarded either in themselves as they lie there, or in reference to the conclusions from them. If the latter be necessary, natural, not forced, then the obligation extends also to these, but it does not exist when they are far-fetched and forced."

Christian Matthias Pfaff (1686-1760) grew up under the influence of the Würtemberg Pietism and exhibited that influence to the end of his life. In his inaugural, as chancellor of the University of Tübingen in 1720, he expressed himself emphatically against those who "coldly and without holy anointing, but only with general preconceptions, enter upon their studies, pervert theology to an empty theory without practice, and expend against heretics the zeal which they ought to employ against ungodliness."* Against the ignorance and religious indifference of the times he exerted himself with great zeal. Nor was he uninfluenced by "the unionistic and irenic efforts that looked to a modification of the confessional differences between Lutherans and Reformed, between Catholics and Protestants. More and more did he become a man of the Illumination which had now begun. His rule was the intelligible and the useful. He still defended doctrine, but in his case its sharp points had been broken off." †

In 1730 he published an edition of the Symbolical Books in Latin with a *Historical Introduction.* He declares that no one ever ascribed *theopneustia* and infallibility to the authors of these books, "nor do we make them equal to the Divine Word, which ALONE is the norm and rule of faith." He says that the idea of norm does not belong to them, except only in a *secondary* sense. The emphasis which he places on ALONE (SOLUM) is exceedingly suggestive.

There was also John Albert Bengel (1687-1752), another Würtemberger, a profound scholar, the father of New Testament textual criticism, prelate and consistorial counsellor, a Pietist through and through, according to the original and churchly conception. One has only to read his *Gnomon,* and his thoughts on Dogmatics and Morals, as the same have been collected by his biographer, to be convinced of his theological position. He deplores the attempt of the Wittenbergers and the Hamburgers to construct a new symbolical book against the Pietists. He declares that the Augsburg Confession, as compared with other books composed in that dark age, is something great. "The

* *Würtembergische Kirchengeschichte,* p. 485.
† *Ut supra.*

other Symbolical Books are so composed that they also ought to be studied, even though they did not have historical significance. Only we must not make a barricade out of them and thus put a check on the divine truth and hinder it from further expansion. To do this would be like commanding the sun not to ascend higher and not to give more light, because on a summer's morning we can read at four o'clock."

In regard to confessional subscription he has expressed himself thus: "The Symbolical Books are a confession of faith to which the Evangelical Church has bound itself. The purpose of subscription is not, indeed, that we wish to bind the servants of the Church to every particular contained in them, as, for example, to every exegetical explanation, but we thereby only testify that we do not approve any of the heresies which they reject. For instance, in the entire controversy on original sin against Flacius, the chief thing is that original sin is not a substance, though it is a very deep-seated corruption. He who believes this proposition can easily subscribe. On the part of superintendents there is no compulsion. Should anyone make many scruples, then there arises the suspicion that there is a snake in the grass. Many a person has wished to be relieved of the prolixity. But that matter cannot be changed. We subscribe cheerfully (bona fide cum libertate animi). Then we conduct our ministry according to conscience. If the superintendents have anything against anyone, they make an investigation. But it is not possible, especially in a large district, to examine everyone on all points. Luther forced no one. He declared that if anyone could do it better, he should do it." *

These six men, Loescher, Hollazius, Buddeus, Walch, Pfaff, Bengel, taken together, in piety, learning and influence, ranked higher in their day than any other theologians of the age, Spener and Francke excepted. They were all, though not in the same degree, influenced by Pietism.† The last three named might be truly regarded as Pietists. Together they represent the theological thought and science of the Lutheran Church outside of Halle. As they spoke and wrote, so, in general, other contemporaneous Lutheran theologians spoke and wrote. And now one has only to recall the confessional position of Jena, of Tübingen, of Würtemberg in the second half of the

* Burk, *J. A. Bengel's Leben und Wirken*, p. 72. See also Dorner, *Hist. Prot. Theology*, English Translation, II., p. 228, note 2.

† For Loescher, see Pünjer, *Hist. of Christ. Philosophy of Religion*, English Translation, p. 280.

sixteenth and throughout the seventeenth century, and to contrast it with what appears on the preceding four or five pages, in order to perceive that the theological mind of Germany has undergone a momentous change. The Lutheran scholastic theology has entirely disappeared, except in so far as it is advocated by Loescher. It is not represented by a single dogmatic or systematic treatise produced in the eighteenth century. The Symbolical Books are still held in reverence, and the public servants of the Church are still required to subscribe them, but they are no longer called *inspired,* nor regarded as perfect in every particular, and subscription is made to the substance and content of doctrine, and not to the letter and form of expression. *Pietism has gained the victory.** The six thousand and more theologians who have gone out from the University of Halle in the first twenty-nine years of its existence, and the controversial agitation have revolutionized theological sentiment. The old orthodoxy is not taught in a single lecture-room in Germany, and we hear of great religious awakenings among the students of Leipzig, Jena and Tübingen. Pietism has brought the theologians, the pastors and the students back to the practical recognition of the formal principle of the Reformation, that the Scriptures alone are inspired, and that they are primary for faith and life, and consequently, that they must have the first place in theological teaching and in the sermon. The theology of the unregenerate is repudiated, and the Symbolical Books are held only a little more rigidly than the Old Lutheran Confessions were held prior to the Peace of Augsburg, 1555. See Chapter XVII.†

3. *Philosophy.*

René Descartes is regarded as the father and founder of modern philosophy. Dissatisfied with the philosophies current in his time, because they started with principles that required to be proved, he began by calling in question all external reality. He announced the negative principle of universal doubt: *De omnibus dubitandum est.* Soon he discovered that the more he thought, the more he doubted, and the more he doubted, the more he thought. But there was one thing which he could not doubt, namely, his own existence. *Cogito ergo sum.* "I think, therefore, I exist." This now became his positive principle, or the firm starting point of his speculations. It is the phil-

* Luthardt, *Geschichte der Christ. Ethik seit der Reformation,* p. 295.
† See von Schubert, *Outlines of Church History,* p. 292.

osophy of consciousness. This principle lies at the foundation of all knowledge, though it is only the knowledge of the mind. It does not include anything that may be predicated of body. Hence we do not *know* the external world.

Descartes also affirmed the existence in us of innate ideas. We have an innate idea of God. This idea comes from God himself and includes the idea of the most perfect being, that is, among other attributes, the idea of the veracity of God. We may, therefore, infer the reality of things external to mind, since a perfectly veracious God would not deceive us. God also is the necessary existence. In the strictest sense he is the only existence. Mind and matter exist, but in a subordinate way. The essence of mind is thought. The essence of matter is extension. The two have nothing in common. He also developed the idea of God and of his activity in such a way as to make the creature a mere machine, and so as to deprive man of moral freedom.

It is easy to see that such speculation, on the one hand, lays the foundation for an excessive *subjectivism*, and on the other hand, that it strongly tends to the overthrow of authority in religion. Indeed, the question may be asked, To what extent does the Cartesian philosophy leave a rational basis for the Christian religion? The Roman Catholic Church, to some extent, answered this question when it placed the works of Descartes in the *Index* of prohibited books *donec corrigantur*. But this philosophy exerted no little influence on theology, at first in the Netherlands, and then in Germany. Its effect was to call into doubt many things that had been taken for granted.

John Locke took a course directly opposite to that of Descartes. He denied the existence of innate ideas, and taught that all knowledge is based on sensation and reflection. This philosophy tended to materialism. As developed, or rather as criticised, by Hume, it led to scepticism in the matter of cause and effect, and in the matter of the credibility of miracles, even to the denial of the *Ego* itself as an independent existence. And with this went, logically, the denial of personal immortality. The philosophy of Locke exerted no little influence in Germany.

But neither Descartes, nor Locke, nor Hume did much, if anything, *directly* to overthrow Aristotelianism in Germany. This achievement was reserved for Christian Thomasius (1655-1728). He began by asserting that the theologians had not made

the proper distinction between the truths of philosophy and the truths of revealed religion, and that they had invaded the sphere of ethics and of jurisprudence. He attacked Aristotle right and left as the unknown God to whom the scholastics had erected an altar. "The greatest evil in this connection was, that the 'school foxes' compelled everything to go into the straight-jacket of the syllogism, and that they would determine everything according to the empty schematism of Aristotle. In order to break its supremacy he labored to introduce a universally intelligible and useful philosophy, which would be available, not merely for the school, but also for the higher life of business.*

Soon Thomasius came into sharp collision with the theologians, who procured his banishment from Leipzig. In a short time he settled (1690) at Halle, with permission to deliver lectures, and when the university was founded he was made professor of philosophy. His fundamental principle was that what agrees with reason is true, and what does not, is false. Necessarily, then, he was an eclectic, and from his time on eclecticism had a home in Germany. His merit is that he freed thought from bondage to any system. The influence which would thus be exerted on the orthodoxy of the seventeenth century is at once apparent, especially since he popularized philosophical subjects by lecturing and writing in the German language. Dorner expresses a correct judgment when he says that Thomasius "essentially coöperated by his much-feared, biting and ready pen, in purifying the literary atmosphere from theological fanaticism and learned stupidity." † It can scarcely be said that he contributed anything really constructive to the thought of his age.‡

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz (1646-1716) brought the doctrine of innate ideas into German speculative philosophy. As Spinoza had posited one substance—all is God and God is all—Pantheism, so Leibnitz posited an infinite number of monads, each one of which mirrors the universe and is a kind of God according to its own nature. Between these monads God has preëstablished a harmonious operation, so that, while mind and body seem to operate on each other, they only act in harmony with each other. Also, this world is the best possible world. God could not have created a better world than the one which he did create. There

* Pünjer, *ut supra*, p. 527. See *Christian Thomasius nach seinen Schicksalen und Schriften dargestellt.* Von H. Luden.

† *History of Protestant Theology*, English Translation, II., p. 259.

‡ See Luden, *Christian Thomasius*, *passim*.

is evil in the world, but it was unavoidable that evil should exist: Metaphysical evil, which is inseparable from the creature; physical evil, as suffering, which is often employed as an instrument for improvement; moral evil, which God permits, because it is a necessary condition of freedom, without which there can be no virtue. In the case of moral evil, God gives the power to act, though the ethically evil quality to act belongs to man, though it springs from his limitations. He asserts the natural immortality of man, but he does not seem to make a clear distinction between natural and revealed religion. He holds that "we do not learn anything as to whether and where a divine revelation has actually taken place. Moses and Christ, although divine prophets, are still represented only as founders, or rather as renovators of natural religion."* He holds that Christianity is the true religion, as natural religion made into a universal law by Christ, but that it has been corrupted and falsified. "Godliness has been turned into ceremonies quite against the opinion of the Divine Master, and doctrine has become encumbered with formulae."

Even with this brief exposition of the Leibnitzian philosophy before us, we need not be surprised to learn that the author has been regarded as the founder of the German *Aufklärung*, though he did not for a time exert much direct influence on the scholars of his country, since the most important of his books were written in French, and since he did not work out a comprehensive system. But the thought is there, and it only awaited an elaborator and popularizer. This it found in Christian Wolff (1679-1754), student of philosophy and theology at Jena, and lecturer on Mathematics and Philosophy in Leipzig in 1703, where his work attracted the attention of Leibnitz. In 1706 he settled at Halle as Professor of Logic, Metaphysics and Ethics, and lectured with such applause as to attract very many of the students from the lecture-rooms of the professors of theology, who managed to bring about his dismissal through a cabinet order from Berlin under peril of the halter, should he remain forty-eight hours. This occurred in 1723. Soon he was the most famous professor in Germany. Seven universities sought him, and four faculties chose him, each as one of its members.

While professor at Marburg (1723-1740) he published his

* See Pünjer, pp. 480 *et seqq.* Bowen, *Modern Philosophy*, Chap. VII. Leibnitz, *New Essays on Human Understanding*. Translated by Langley. Macmillan Company, 1896. *The Monadology*. Translated by Latta. Clarendon Press.

epoch-making *Theologia Naturalis* (1736), in which he uses the cosmological argument to demonstrate the existence of God, declares that God called the world into existence by his will, and permitted sin as a means for good. On the one hand the Wolffian philosophy excited a great amount of opposition, so that by the year 1740 it was known to have seventy literary opponents, and on the other hand it called forth a great amount of approbation, so that as early as 1737 one hundred and seven literary Wolffians were known to exist. Pünjer says that "all the universities and all the schools were dominated by them; the whole of the sciences were cultivated in accordance with the mathematico-demonstrative method, and according to the criterion of the sufficient reason." * Men administered medicine, wrote poetry, catechised, preached and prayed, according to the Wolffian philosophy. Even Hebrew grammars and works on the accents appeared according to the mathematical method. Soon it overcame the opposition of the theologians and they theologized according to the system of Wolff. Frank has described the situation thus: "The Holy Scriptures, as the source of doctrinal proof and the exegesis of the Scriptures, passed to the rear. The philosophical disquisition took its place. Students were no longer willing to suck *lac ignorantiae* from the professors, or to study theology prior to philosophy. The revealed doctrines were in general held, but were placed on the tripod of the Wolffian philosophy and were sought to be confirmed by the probable grounds of reason. For the majority the real arena was *Natural Theology* and with this the proofs for the existence of God. Wolff had said: 'God created the world for the purpose of making known his invisible nature, especially his wisdom, power and goodness. Hence it were well, if, in their study of nature, men would give attention chiefly to that which serves to that end.' Then the pastors, imparting a theological coloring to their favorite scientific studies, like ants, brought from every realm of nature proofs for the existence of an all-powerful, and all-wise and an all-gracious God, and proofs for the sufficient reason why things are, rather than are not, and why they are so and not otherwise." †

Now, the Wolffian philosophy is but the culmination of the philosophical thinking which began with Descartes. The philosophers differed from each other, the systems differed from each other, the systems were not internally harmonious, but they

* *Ut supra*, p. 528.
† *Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie*, II., 400.

conspired, consciously or unconsciously, in the production of a common result. The new philosophy *liberated the human reason;* it routed the "school-foxes"; it taught men *to do their own thinking.* In reaching this sublime conclusion, philosophy was not a little assisted by jurisprudence through Hugo Grotius and Samuel Pufendorf, who wrought in a free and independent way in the field of theology. Leibnitz was primarily a jurist. Thomasius began his career at Leipzig with lectures on Grotius and Pufendorf, and his most influential work in the direction of enlightenment, the one that gave the greatest offense to his theological contemporaries, bore a title that is at least half juristic. These jurists all discarded the syllogistic method and emphasized the place and value of the human understanding. Pufendorf was specially hostile to the "peripatetic knights," as he called the disciples of Aristotle, who applied the syllogism in all their excogitations, and failed to make the proper distinction between theology and philosophy. In a word, the new philosophy in its essential aspects was a prolonged battle against the reigning scholastic theology, and in this it joined hands with Pietism, though in some of its manifestations it found a bitter foe in Pietism, especially in its earlier phenomena through Thomasius and Wolff.*

But by and by the new philosophy gained the victory. It not only downed the scholastic theology, but it struck alliance with Pietism, as when, in 1740, Wolff was brought back to Halle in a triumphal chariot, taught philosophy there again to the end of his days on earth. In the department of Biblical Criticism it soon undermined the authority of the Elzevir Text through Bengel and Wettstein. In the Old Testament, John David Michaelis, freed from the trammels of the past, investigated the text and the history of the books of the Old Testament, and advanced and improved the historical method of interpretation, by which it was found that many passages of Scripture could not be applied as they had been previously applied; while John August Ernesti introduced a better method of interpreting the New Testament, demolished the theory that the New Testament was written in pure Greek, and overthrew the doctrine of *emphases,* which stood in the way of a proper historical and grammatical interpretation of the New Testament. And a new spirit

* See von Schubert, *Outlines of Church History,* pp. 284, 296 *et seqq.,* and Baur, *Dogmengeschichte,* III., 325 *et seqq.,* and 451 *et seqq.,* for sketches on the influence of Leibnitz and Wolff.

entered into the composition of Church History through Buddeus, Pfaff and Mosheim. History began to be written as a science for the purpose of exhibiting the course of events, and not for the purpose of maintaining a thesis, or for the purpose of furnishing materials to be used in constructing and defending dogma.

It was in the department of Dogmatics, however, that the Wolffian philosophy exerted its greatest influence. Men undertook to construct systems of theology according to the Wolffian method of argumentation. The most prominent of these were Jacob Carpovius (1699-1768), first at Jena and then at Weimar, and Siegmund Jacob Baumgarten * (1706-1757), after 1730 professor at Halle. The former published (1737-1765) his *Theologia Revelata Dogmatica, Methodo Scientifica Adornata.* The title at once indicates the "method." The Preface is virtually a laudation and defense of the "scientific method" in its application to theology. The author professes to understand the Wolffian method, but regrets that, because he had not studied mathematics, he cannot properly apply it. But he has applied it in such a way as to clothe the Lutheran doctrines "in algebraic and mathematical garments for the purpose of making the light that enlightens men unto salvation shine more brightly by being polished." † His work shows little or no influence from the Symbolical Books, though he allows that they "are only norma normata." ‡ He tries to demonstrate the entire system of Christian doctrines so that they may be understood by the human reason. His dependence on Wolff is apparent, but he has certainly constructed the coldest, the most formal, the most unserviceable exhibition of the Christian doctrines that has ever been written. It has been well described by Gass: "In Carpovius the treatment of doctrine degenerates into a scholasticism whose dense texture leaves no interstices through which the religious spirit may flash." § His work created a short-lived sensation, but then it fell into an oblivion as dense as that which surrounds some of the dogmatic and polemical efforts of the seventeenth century.

Baumgarten's *Evangelische Glaubenslehre,* published after his death in three volumes by Semler, may be called the Pietistic

* Dorner calls Baumgarten "a personified compendium of modified Church doctrine, Pietism and Wolffianism." *History of Protestant Theology,* II., 281.

† Frank, II., 402. See Gass, III., 168 *et seqq.*

‡ Tom., I., 298.

§ *Geschichte,* III., 173.

Didactic. A *Dogmatic* in the sense of the *Loci*, or of the *Systema* of the seventeenth century, it cannot be called. It possesses neither their scheme nor their spirit. It is Wolffian in form, but Pietistic in spirit. The author devotes four theses to the discussion of *Oratio, Meditatio, Tentatio,* "as *helps for the salutary or living knowledge* of the divine truths." The first is a *habitus supernaturalis;* the second consists in a careful study of the divine truths in their historical connection, and in their relations one with another; the third is the application of the truths learned to our own relations in life. Should these helps be employed merely for the advancement of the science of theology, they are thereby enfeebled. Baumgarten also closes the discussion of each doctrine with a disquisition on the comforts and the duties that arise from the doctrine, reminding us, in this procedure, of Spener's sermons. He presents the Lutheran doctrine of the sacraments in a didactic, but not in a controversial form. He denies that ubiquity belongs to the human nature of Christ, and thinks that the expression *ubiquitas extensiva* ought not to be used.* He declares that exorcism has no foundation, either in the command of God or in the necessity of the thing. It may be employed as an *adiaphoron,* but should not be required of anyone.† He has been regarded as the bridge over which his disciples advanced in the direction of Rationalism.

And now if we inquire about the Symbolical Books, we find them in existence rather than in influence. They are not quoted by Baumgarten in his *Glaubenslehre.* They are not regarded as the test or as the limit of theological thinking. New views and new methods appear on every hand. The Aristotelian Schematism has disappeared; though in so far as theology has come into bondage to the Wolffian method, it has gained very little by the change of masters. But in so far as in consequence of the new philosophy, men were led or driven to a deeper and more comprehensive study of the Scriptures, theology has much for which to be thankful.

4. *Rationalism.*

Historians have not been agreed as to who or what is responsible for Rationalism. The defenders and advocates of the old Orthodoxy have usually laid the blame on the Pietists and on Pietism. The Pietists have charged it to the account of the old Orthodoxy. In our judgment both are to blame. The old Orthodoxy had become chiefly a religion of the understanding. It con-

* Vol. II., 108. † Vol. III., 321.

tained very little for the heart; and it had produced very unevangelical conditions in Germany, as for instance, Caesaropapism, hierarchical notions of the ministry, the virtual restoration of the *opus operatum*. Pietism, which from the beginning had scarcely laid sufficient stress on the study of theology as a science, in the second half of the eighteenth century became, in many of its manifestations, a veritable travesty of Christianity, and expressed itself ostentatiously in groans and pious ejaculations. Such an exhibition of Christianity could not satisfy the religious understanding. The joint result of the interaction and counteraction of the two extremes was confusion. The new philosophy intervened to work the *Aufklärung*. We may say, therefore, that the immediate progenitor of Rationalism was the new philosophy. Repelled by the old Orthodoxy and disgusted with the new Pietism, thinking men groped round to find something that could satisfy both the understanding and the heart at the same time. Biblical Criticism, History, Didactic, all influenced more or less by the reigning philosophy, pointed the way, for scholars in general had come to feel that they must follow reason and truth whithersoever they might lead, though many still protested against the new philosophy, or rather against its excessive use in natural religion, since natural religion, however valuable it might be as a *Pedagogic*, could not lead to the discovery of Christ. Thus we have for a time the struggle between Supranaturalism and Rationalism. The former based Christianity directly on a revelation from God and declared that it exhibits truths through prophecy and miracles which cannot be known by the human reason. The latter accepted reason as the supreme arbiter, so that whatever does not agree with the conclusions of the human reason, whatever cannot be comprehended by the human reason, does not form a part of the Rationalist's creed. This is essentially the position taken by Johann Salomo Semler, who is regarded as the father of theological Rationalism. In his investigation of the Canon of Scripture, he denied that the Canon had been formed according to a plan, and tried to show that the books of the Bible were brought together by some accidental considerations, and that they were not intended to be a norm of faith for all men. The Old Testament was intended for the Jews. Matthew wrote his Gospel for the Jews beyond Palestine, and John wrote for Greek Christians. Jesus and the apostles accommodated themselves to the Jewish myths and interpretations. Paul did not lay the

chief emphasis on miracles and history—that to him was "flesh"—but upon the "Spirit." Paul was the first to make Christianity a universal religion. The Catholic Epistles were written for the purpose of uniting Jewish and Gentile Christians. Only that can be regarded as permanent in Christianity which contributes to our moral improvement.

The effect of such views, united with the reigning philosophy as employed and developed by other theologians, soon brought Rationalism to ascendency in nearly all the theological faculties, though not by any means in every case to the same degree of boldness. Various treatises on dogmatics were produced, from which the supernatural element was almost entirely excluded. Wegscheider's *Institutiones Theologiae Christianae Dogmaticae* (1815. *Editio Quinta* in 1825) may be regarded as the true representative of Rationalism in the department of Dogmatics. The book is dedicated, with an elaborate eulogy, "to the blessed *manes* of Martin Luther." In the Preface (1825) the author proposes *first* to state "the system of *Supranaturalism* according to the symbolical form of the Lutheran Church, with additions from the Reformed *Confessions,*" then to add the history of each dogma, and also to exhibit the purer type of the doctrine of religion in accordance with the laws of the human reason, "which is called the system of *Rationalism.*" The doctrine of Inspiration (§ 44) is that the authors of the Scriptures, *Deo juvante,* consigned their pious thoughts to letters. These thoughts were intended only for their contemporaries; but they were so arranged that the knowledge and the teaching of the Christian religion, which are to be adapted to an age of superior culture, can be derived from them.

Christ is a man who earned the right to be called the Son of God; his death was a sign that sacrifices have been abolished. God is not a blood-thirsty Moloch; it is only necessary for the sinner to mend his life; the resurrection was recovery from a swoon; the ascension was a myth like that in regard to Romulus; righteousness before God is not acquired by works, nor only by faith, but by a disposition well-pleasing to God; the effect of the Word is natural; there are no supernatural operations of God upon man; the sacraments are mere symbols; Baptism is a rite of consecration; the Lord's Supper is a memorial.

Rationalism gained the ascendency also in the sphere of practical theology. The old liturgies were discarded and new forms

of worship of the milk-and-water type were introduced. The proposition was made to use in the administration of the Lord's Supper, these words: "Enjoy this bread; may the spirit of worship rest upon you with full blessing! Enjoy a little wine! No virtuous power lies in this wine: it lies in you, in God's doctrine, and in God." * The good old hymns were so philistianized as to be deprived of their rhythm and of their evangelical sentiment, and the music employed in many cases was the music of the opera and of the dance.† The preaching in most of the pulpits was as outlandish, as inane, as unevangelical as was that described in the preceding chapter of this book. "For conversion or regeneration, they spoke of amendment of life; for justification, of forgiveness on condition of repentance: for the Holy Spirit, of the exercise of the higher reason: for the atonement of Christ, of the spirit of sacrifice which He has taught us by his example, and so on." ‡ The morals of the people sunk to a low level. The preaching of "morality" and of "common sense" in religion brought its own nemesis.§

But how did the Creeds fare under the rule of Rationalism? Formally and externally they stood in their place. Even leading Rationalists did not demand their abolition. But in general, they were held in low esteem and exerted very little influence on theological thinking, or on the preaching of the times. Semler lectured on the Symbolical Books, and published an *Apparatus* on the same (1775), in which he speaks of "our symbolical books." But he declares in the *Preface* that Luther's catechisms contain matters ill-adapted to public instruction and that the Formula of Concord, aside from its historical character, has no great or permanent value "for us," and says that it is not required of theologians that they shall not depart at all from the authority and norm of the Symbolical Books: "Therefore, provided the sacred right of the Lutheran congregations be preserved, provided the members grow in the Christian virtues, safe from ungodly tyranny in sacred matters, and from noxious errors such as pervert the true salvation of man: in other things it is free to every diligent and faithful minister to say nothing about the articles not rightly set forth in this or that place in those books, such as the Descent of Christ, the third use of the

* Hagenbach, *History of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries*, I., 313, notes.

† Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, p. 195. Hagenbach, II., 141.

‡ Ker's *History of Preaching*, p. 247.

§ See Hase, *History of the Chr. Church*. Eng. Transl., pp. 544-5.

Mosaic law, the *oral* supernatural manducation of the body of Christ without its salutary efficacy, etc., or to explain them better and more fully."

This statement of a fact is confirmed by another Rationalist of deepest dye,* who, in the *Preface* to his *Systema Theologiae Lutheranae Orthodoxum* (1785), says: "There are men sneaking around among us who seem to profess the official doctrine of the Church, from which they get their living; but in reality they retain scarcely anything, except the *terms* of the old theologians, to which they give different conceptions, so that by an ambiguous style of teaching, the superintendents of the Church are deceived and students are confounded, and, midway between barbarism and wisdom, are kept swimming just as in a vast whirlpool."

Bretschneider, another Rationalist, has borne similar testimony. In his *Handbuch der Dogmatik des Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche* (1814, 1822, 1828) he says: "It is evident that our Church, when she declares that these books (the Symbolical Books) contain her confession of faith, does not have reference to their entire content in the *most rigid* sense, nor mean that such a declaration is to be applied without exception to all that they contain, but she quietly and as a matter of course has reference to the parts of the content of the Symbolical Books, which contain doctrine and confession. For a large part of the content is in no sense of a character to belong to the Christian faith, as for example, the historical introductions, the preface to the Augsburg Confession, and to the Catechisms, the *status controversiae* before each article of the Formula of Concord, the prayers in the Catechisms. What, according to the content, is in no sense doctrine and does not belong to doctrine, can never be made a doctrinal prescription or be reckoned a confession of doctrine. It must also be understood that the Church has not meant to sanction the entire content, but only the doctrine and the confession of these books, as that is declared in the Saxon formula of subscription." †

Bretschneider was for a time professor of philosophy and theology at Wittenberg, and from 1816 general superintendent at Gotha. He speaks, therefore, from the standpoint of knowledge and authority in regard to a fact. He tells us in a note that "in the religious oath prescribed in Saxony it is only meant

* C. F. Bahrdt, notorious for his immoral character.
† Vol. I., 29.

that the teachers of the Church 'shall persevere in the pure *doctrine* and Christian *Confession* of these lands, as the same are contained in the unaltered Augsburg Confession and are *explained* in the Book of Concord.' '' But that the Symbolical Books did not exert much influence on Bretschneider, either as a theologian or as an ecclesiastical official, is evident from his *Handbuch;* and that they had in general lost very much of their influence under the rationalistic thought of the age is shown by the fact that they scarcely ever emerge high enough to be seen either in the best representative of the Halle Biblical School (George Christian Knapp, 1753-1825), or in the best representatives of the supranaturalistic school of Tübingen, Storr and Flatt, who in their *Handbook of Dogmatic* seem to have been more influenced by Immanuel Kant than by the Symbolical Books. Though there were those who still defended the Symbolical Books, and who did not bow the knee to the Moloch of Rationalism.

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE CONFESSIONS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Rationalism brought theological confusion, ecclesiastical disorder and moral declension upon Protestant Germany. It had driven Supranaturalism from one concession to another, until the line that separated the two had, in many instances, almost disappeared.* The leading works on Biblical Literature and on systematic theology seem to have had their point of contact in supporting a religion of reason, rather than a religion of revelation. Schleiermacher's epoch-making work, *Discourses on Religion addressed to the Cultured among its Despisers,* implies in the title, and declares in the text, that "now especially the life among the cultured people is far from anything that might have the resemblance of religion." † Of the ecclesiastical disorder, and of the moral declension, we learn only too much from the historians.‡ The German people generally had lost their ideals, both patriotic and religious. To this loss, no doubt, is due the terrible humiliation at Jena in 1806. But when the German people awoke to a sense of their humiliation they began to turn for help to the God of their fathers. Their war-songs were now hymns of devotion, and their battle-cries were prayers to "the King of Glory, the Lord mighty in battle." Germany had grown tired of Rationalism, tired of "a religion of morality," of a religion of "self-redemption." Some cried, "Back to Luther," others cried, "Forward from Luther." The faith of the great religious hero rose in vision before them, and the spirit of *Ein feste Burg* spoke in their hearts. Germany stood on the threshold of a new Reformation. The man who pointed the way was at hand.

1. *Schleiermacher.*

Here was a man who was at the same time two men. The one belonged to the eighteenth century. The other belonged to

* See Reinhard's *Geständnisse.* Letter IX. Failing to obtain a copy of Reinhard's *Geständnisse* in the original, we employed a translation published by Sheldon and Company, New York, in 1868.

† *First Discourse.*

‡ Kurtz, III., § 172; Hagenbach, *ut supra,* II., 140, 141; Hase, *Church History,* § § 445, 446.

the nineteenth century. The latter prevailed over the former and drew the younger generation after him. He was a philosopher, and rose superior to the Illuminati in the very thing which they regarded as supreme. He was a Christian of the Pietistic type, and was animated with a sincere love for the Christ they despised. His philosophy and his piety were so blended that each illumined and sustained the other. As a hundred years earlier Pietism overthrew a frigid orthodoxy, as fifty years earlier Philosophy overthrew maudlin Pietism, so now a saner Philosophy and a chastened Pietism unite to overthrow an irreligious Rationalism.

Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768-1834) was superbly trained in philosophy, was a master in every theological discipline and was as pious as he was learned. Treitschke, the historian of Germany in the nineteenth century, who ascribes to Schleiermacher a place second to none in awakening the patriotism that finally overthrew Napoleon, says: "He became the renovator of our theology, the greatest of all our theologians since the Reformation, and even yet no German theologian arrives at inward liberty who has not settled accounts with Schleiermacher's ideas." * But, also, he differed from all his predecessors in theology. Orthodoxy found the seat of religion in authority; Pietism found it in doing; Rationalism found it in reason. Schleiermacher finds the place of religion not in authority, nor in the reason, but in the *feeling,* in the sense of absolute dependence upon the Infinite; it is something born in man, and "Piety, which forms the basis of all fellowship in the Church, considered *per se,* is neither a knowing nor a doing, but a determination of the feeling or of the immediate self-consciousness." †

Schleiermacher's description of religion is both beautiful and profound: "The contemplation of the pious is the immediate consciousness of the universal existence of all finite things, in and through the Infinite, and of all temporal things in and through the Eternal. Religion is to seek this and find it in all that lives and moves, in all growth and change, in all doing and suffering. It is to have life and to know life in immediate feeling, only as such an existence in the Infinite and Eternal. Where this is found, religion is satisfied: where it hides itself, there is unrest and anguish, extremity and death. And thus it is a life in

* Oman, *Introduction to Discourses,* p. xi.
† *Der Christliche Glaube,* I., 6.

the infinite nature of the whole, in the One and in the All, in God, having and possessing all things in God, and God in all. Yet religion is not knowledge and science, either of the world or of God. Without being knowledge, it recognizes knowledge and science. In itself it is an affection, a revelation of the Infinite in the finite, God being seen in it and it in God." *

Schleiermacher did not confess the full Deity of Jesus Christ, but he recognizes him as the First-born Son, as the only sinless Being that ever entered this world, as the perfect Example, who saves us, not by his atonement through regeneration and justification, nor by his example, but by penetrating us with the power of his life and renewing us so that we become righteous. He handles the Scriptures with great freedom, but finds in them all that is necessary for the support of the religious life "divine essence and heavenly power." Nevertheless, both the *Discourses* and the *Christian Faith according to the Fundamental Principles of the Evangelical Church* (1821, 1830), and his other publications composed in the same spirit, exerted an immense influence on the theology and on the ecclesiastical conditions of the age. They led men to think, to approve, to oppose. His followers were many. Some of these, acting also under the influence of Hegel, obliqued to the left in the direction of Pantheism and Atheism. Others (Twesten, Nitzsch, Neander) went straight forward toward the Confessions, and to an evangelical Christianity that confessed the Deity of Christ and the supreme authority of the Scriptures as the rule of faith.

2. *Claus Harms.*

Claus Harms (1778-1855) stands as one of the holy figures of the Lutheran Church. He was born a peasant, but rose to be a prince in the house of his God. While a student at the University of Kiel he read Schleiermacher's *Discourses* almost at a single sitting. When he finished the book, he flung away the Rationalism that had shaken the faith of his childhood. Thenceforward he looked on Schleiermacher as his spiritual father, but he added: "He that begat me had no bread for me." He needed yet "to bury dead Rationalism in its grave," as he says, and to return to the firm standing ground of Luther and of the Lutheran faith before he could satisfy the religious aspirations of his soul. After a few years spent in a country pastorate, he returned to Kiel, where his preaching excited uncommon attention. The university

* Second and Fifth Discourses.

opposed him as "an obscurantist, a darkener of the light of reason, a retailer of old worn-out ideas; he and his Bible and Luther." But he went right on preaching the pure, simple Gospel. Opposition soon ceased. Even Eckermann, the leader of Kiel Rationalism, seldom missed a service. During the third centennial of the Reformation, 1817, he preached a sermon on Article IV. of the Augsburg Confession, and recalled attention to the almost forgotten material principle of the Reformation. The same year he republished Luther's Ninety-five Theses, together with ninety-five of his own. He begins by throwing down the following challenge: "The following theses which are directed against all kinds of errors and confessions within the Lutheran Church, the writer is ready further to explain, to prove, defend, and answer for. In case the labor should become too great for him all at once, he prays all Lutherans and those who agree with him, and are able to speak or write, for their fraternal aid. If he himself is convinced of error, he will send his acknowledgment unto the world as frankly and freely as he sends forth these theses. For the rest, everything to the honor of God, to the welfare of the Church, and in grateful memory of Luther." I. "When our Master and Lord Jesus Christ says: 'Repent,' he wills that man shall be conformed to his doctrine, but he does not conform to men, as is now done with the altered spirit of the times;" VI. "Christian doctrine and Christian life are to be built up after the same plan;" VIII. "Luther's antichrist was the Pope;" IX. "The Pope of our time, our antichrist, in respect of faith we may say, is reason; in respect of action, conscience, which has been crowned with a triple crown: Legislation, commendation and blame, reward and punishment;" XI. Conscience cannot pardon sins, in other words, no one can pardon his own sins. Forgiveness belongs to God. XXI. "In the sixteenth century, the pardon of sins cost money at least. In the nineteenth it is entirely free; for each one administers it to himself;" XXIV. " 'Two states, O man, thou hast before thee,' we read in the old hymn-book. In more recent times the devil has been slain, and hell has been plugged up;" XXVII. "According to the old faith, God created man. According to the new faith, man creates God, and when he has finished him he says, Aha!" XXXII. "The so-called religion of reason is devoid of reason, or devoid of religion, or devoid of both." XXXIII. "According to it the moon is held to be the sun." XXXVII. "He who understands the first letter of religion, which is 'holy,' let him send for me."

L. "We have a sure Bible word, unto which we take heed, and to guard against the use of force to turn and twist this like a weather-cock we have our Symbolical Books." LXXV. "As a poor maiden, the Lutheran is to be made rich by being married. Do not perform the ceremony over Luther's bones. They might become alive at it, and then—woe to you." LXXVII. "To say that time has removed the wall of partition between the Lutherans and Reformed is not a straightforward mode of speech. It is necessary to ask which fell away from the faith of their Church, the Lutherans or the Reformed? or both?" XCII. "The Evangelical Catholic Church is a glorious Church; it holds and conforms itself chiefly to the Sacraments." XCIII. "The Evangelical Reformed Church is a glorious Church; it holds and conforms itself chiefly to the Word." XCIV. "More glorious than both is the Evangelical Lutheran Church; it holds and conforms itself both to the Sacraments and to the Word of God." XCV. "Into the Lutheran Church both the others are developing, even without the intentional aid of men. But the way of the ungodly shall perish, says David. Ps. 1:6."*

These theses, so full of homely wit and biting sarcasm, are directed about equally against Rationalism and against the efforts at ecclesiastical union, which had been already made in several parts of Germany. As might be naturally expected, they aroused sharp antagonism in the breasts of Rationalists and of Unionists. About two hundred pamphlets were sent forth in reply. Harms defended his theses in two essays. Sympathy and sentiment and judgment were soon on his side. From this time on, more actively than before, superintendents, professors of theology, and pastors of churches, turned away from Rationalism and found repose in the doctrines of the Confessions and began to restore the substance of the old liturgies and the old hymnbooks and to defend the old doctrine of repentance and faith.

3. *Ecclesiastical Union.*

When the German youth, who had mingled prayers with their battle cries, returned home from the last Napoleonic wars, with

* The title of these theses is: Das sind die 95 Theses oder Streitsätze Dr. Luthers, teuren Andenkens. Zum besonderen Druck besorgt und mit andern 95 Sätzen als mit einer Uebersetzung aus dem Jahre 1517 in 1817 begleitet von Claus Harms, Archidiakonus an der St. Nicolaikirche in Kiel. Kiel im Verlag der akademischen Buchhandlung, 1817.

These Theses in the original are given by Tischhauser, *Geschichte der Evang. Kirche* Deutschlands, Basel, 1900, pp. 343 *et seqq.* In English in *The Lutheran Cyclopedia,* New York, 1899.

victory perched on their banners, all Germany lifted its heart in gratitude to God for freedom. Not much stress was laid on difference of creed. At the battle of Leipzig (1813) the Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Austria, and the King of Prussia had knelt together in prayer for triumph over the destroyer of the peace of Europe. Now that the wars are over, the Czar proposed the Holy Alliance "to establish Christianity, above all differences of creed, as the supreme law for the life of the nations." *

The Alliance was a witness to the return of a deeper and more generous religious spirit. The Confessions had slumbered. They had been greatly ignored. And now it was that Frederick William III., King of Prussia, sought to realize the dream of his Brandenburg ancestors that there should be one Evangelical Church in his dominions. Accordingly, May 2, 1817, he addressed a letter to Bishop Sack and Provost Hanstein, in which he said, he expected from them propositions for the easiest and most appropriate manner of uniting the two slightly divergent confessions.† A little later, in the same year, he declared in substance that he was convinced that both Protestant Churches were one in essence and differed only in externals; that in their union he saw a work of God by which the Church would be greatly quickened. He defined the union as one in which the Reformed should surrender nothing to the Lutheran, nor this to that. Together they should become a revived Evangelical Church in the spirit of the Divine Master.

Gradually, through changes and modifications of plans, by Cabinet orders and synodical resolutions, the Prussian Union took such form that its legal status could be thus described by Stahl: "According to its general character the Evangelical National Church of Prussia is a *unitary organism*, which already in its innermost center and through its entire development consists of *two confessions*. The National Church is not a United Church. It does not have a common evangelical confession on which it stands as a National Church. But it stands through and through on the Lutheran and Reformed confessions, which differ from each other. It does not have common evangelical organs and elements, but its organs, from the highest to the lowest, and its elements are Lutheran or Reformed: The members of the highest Consistory, of the Provincial Consistory, the preachers, the

* Hagenbach *ut supra*, II., 343. Hase, § 491.
† Tischhauser, *ut supra*, p. 493.

congregations. It is through and through a dualism of two, not of united, confessions. The Evangelical National Church is not united. It has merely elements of union. As a National Church it has only the one element of union: The common, but yet not undistinguishable, Church government. But their respective congregations, and probably by far the larger part of them, have also the element of union in that they do not refuse external Church fellowship to those of the other confession. Accordingly, the National Church is not a Union Church, but it is a Lutheran and Reformed Church for those of the two confessions which it contains. . . .

"Considered in its individual relations, the National Church has *no confessional fellowship,* but the assurance was unqualifiedly given that such does not exist, yea, even that it is not effected by entrance into the union. However, there are some regulations which conflict with this fundamental principle and with this assurance: The pledging of the ministers to the Evangelical confessions, the regulation about the ordering of the congregation so that each congregation stands on the foundation of the confessions of the Reformation, the older regulations about fellowship of the teachers, which have not been expressly rescinded." *

In 1822 the candidates for the ministry pledged themselves to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, to the three ecumenical creeds, and to "the Symbolical Books as known and universally received in the Evangelical Church." † This formula of subscription underwent modification until, finally, the candidate pledged himself "to preach no other doctrine than that which is founded on the pure, clear Word of God as contained in the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments, our only rule of faith, and attested in the three Christian chief symbols, the Apostles', the Nicene, the Athanasian, and the confessional writings of our Church" (which are here named). ‡

The Prussian National Church may be regarded as a confederated union of the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches. Each Church has modified the other, though in spirit and in teaching the union is prevailingly Lutheran as over against the characteristic features of the Reformed Church. The order of worship, as set forth in the *Agende,* has been always essentially

* *Die Lutherische Kirche und Union,* pp. 490, 491.
† Köllner, I., p. 122; Seeberg, *Die Kirche Deutschlands im neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* pp. 71 *et seqq.*
‡ *Agende.*

Lutheran, though it presents both the Reformed and the Lutheran formulas of distribution for the administration of the Lord's Supper, "to be used according to the local order of worship." Many ardent confessional Lutherans have been ardent defenders of the Prussian Union and have lived and labored in the Prussian National Church without having the feeling of restraint on their consciences; and only recently (1907) the General Evangelical Lutheran Conference, which stands on the Lutheran Confession, has recognized the Lutheranism of those members of the Prussian Union who adhere to the Lutheran Confessions; and at the twelfth convention of the said Conference, held in Hanover, September 14 to 17, 1908, the delegates of the Lutherans in the Prussian Union were formally received into the Conference as members.

4. *Confessionalists and Anti-Confessionalists.*

Harms' *Theses,* the controversy that ensued, and the consummation of the Union in the Prussian Provinces, drew the attention of Lutherans to the Confessions and to the study of the same. The result of such study was opposition to the Union movements, devotion to the Confessions and the construction of a systematic theology, determined more or less by, but not brought under servility to, the Confessions.

Foremost among the opponents of the Union was Rudelbach, pastor and superintendent at Glauchau, who in 1839 published his *Reformation, Lutherthum und Union,* as a historico-dogmatic apology for the Lutheran Church and its doctrines; and in 1841 his *Introduction to the Augsburg Confession.* By his side, in principle, stood Guericke, professor at Halle, who in 1839 published a work on symbolics. At Breslau, in 1841, a Lutheran Synod was organized with special reference to the maintenance of the old Lutheran doctrines as contained in the Confessions. Interest in the Confessions during the same period was promoted by the publication of numerous editions of the Symbolical Books (Schöpff, 1826; Hase, 1827; Meyer, 1830; Francke, 1846; Detzer, 1846; Müller, 1847, and others), some with and some without observations and introductions; and also by the lectures of Marheineke in *Comparative Symbolics* in the University of Berlin, and by the publication of Köllner's *Symbolics* in 1837. During the same decades appeared many pamphlets which discussed, in one way and in another, the question

of the authority and value to the Church of the Symbolical Books.* Superintendents, professors and learned pastors took part in the discussions. Many argued that more significance should be attached to the Confessions at ordination than for a long time had been done. Some, however, took an opposite view. For a time the controversy was conducted with great vigor on both sides between Hengstenberg (after 1824, at Berlin) and Bretschneider, General Superintendent at Gotha. The former employed the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung,* and the latter the *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung,* as his medium of communication. The former contended for the abiding obligatoriness of the Confession. The latter argued against such obligatoriness. Each represented a class, the Symbolists and the Anti-Symbolists, as they were then called. The controversy between the two parties gathered round the following affirmations and negations:

"The Symbolists affirm that the Symbolical Books are normated by the Holy Scripture, are clearer statements, sharper definitions of the doctrine of Scripture (in so far then norma normata).

"The Anti-Symbolists affirm that this is not the case.

"The Symbolists mean that the ministers shall be pledged to the Symbolical Books as norm of faith and norm of doctrine, because the Symbolical Books contain the doctrine of the Scripture.

"The Anti-Symbolists mean that the ministers shall not be pledged to the Symbolical Books as norm of faith and doctrine, because and inasmuch as the Symbolical Books go beyond the doctrine of the Scripture and in many points pass it by, and because each one, in a pledge to the Symbolical Books, naturally fixes his eye on the sentences and definitions in which is found a *deviation* from the simple doctrine of the Scripture." †

This may be regarded as a clear and impartial statement of the points at issue on the Symbolical question as discussed in the many and learned treatises before us. It does not appear that anyone wished to abolish the Symbolical Books entirely, for even a Paulus of Jena had subscribed the Symbolical Books, and they still had legal standing in the various national churches. Rather was the question, What is the *meaning* of subscription

* The Library of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, at Gettysburg, Pa., possesses a valuable collection of these pamphlets.

† *Symboliker und Antisymboliker.* Worüber ist der *Streit? Klar und deutsch beantwortet* von Robert Gerhard, Pastor zu Schwoitsch, Diöces Breslau I., 1843, p. 12.

to the Symbolical Books? The Symbolists insisted that the subscriber bound himself to follow the Symbolical Books as the norm of his teaching. Some few theologians seem to have insisted on requiring obligation to the letter of the Confession. But the view presented in the classic essay of Dr. Ernst Sartorius, General Superintendent in the Province of Prussia: *The Necessity and Obligation of the Confessions of the Church* (1845), represents the prevalent sentiment of the Symbolists. He declares that the Bible, as the *authentic* Word of the divine revelation, is the sole divine canon of the faith and life of men. "The symbol which follows it as a human witness and confession of faith in its divine truth is entirely subordinate. . . . The Symbol is not intended to be, and should not be, a second Bible, nor an ecclesiastical continuation or expansion of the prophetical Word, but it is intended to be only a reflection of its light. It is intended only to testify that and how the truth concretely contained and revealed historically in it, and whose light is to enlighten the dark souls of men, has really entered into their knowledge and their faith, and has established the Christian fellowship among them. Hence, so subordinate as the human confession is to the Divine Word, so inseparably necessary must it yet appear in connection with the same. For the Divine Revelation was given to men, not to remain hid from them in contradiction to itself, but that it may be manifest to them, and be to them in common, truth, light and life, which it really has become, when it is known and believed by them, and as such witnessed and confessed, and thereby unites them as a congregation of believers, or as a Church, which is the spiritual body of Christ." *

Sartorius insists that the Symbols are not ecclesiastical laws for teaching, or prescriptions for faith, but confessions and witnesses of the recognized Christian truth, and that the ministers are not legislators of doctrine in any sense, nor masters of the faith of the Church, but only confessors and witnesses of the Divine Word in fellowship with the congregation.† In this principle Sartorius is sustained by Æmilius Ludwig Richter, professor of law in the University of Marburg, who in *Das Kirchenregiment und die Symbole* (1839), p. 43, declares: "Rightly does the ecclesiastical government require of every minister that he refrain from all polemic which conflicts with the received doctrinal system. But not only is a negative rela-

* P. 5.

† Pp. 12, 13.

tion to doctrine expected of him. This requirement must be held to mean that his work in teaching joins itself primarily to the confessions of the Church which has called him to the office of teaching. But it is not understood that it is a pledge to preach according to the letter of the Symbols, and this is self-evident, for the Church cannot wish to bind the free spirit with chains, thereby to set itself in contradiction to its own principle."

And in his *Kirchenrecht* (2d edition, 1844, p. 439) Richter says: "In fact, the pledge rests, not according to one's own subjective views, but already in assuming the office, only in the fundamental principle of the Confessions to preach the Gospel. But there are also good reasons for a special pledge, for inasmuch as the Church has committed to the ministers the care of the faith of the congregations, it must seek by an express admonition of the consciences of the ministers to have a guarantee that the care shall be used only on the principle on which the Church itself has been founded. In this there is no encroachment on the freedom of conscience or on the freedom of teaching, because the Church compels no one to teach contrary to his conscience, and because freedom without limitations is not freedom, but arbitrariness." This is quoted with approbation by Dr. Adolph Harless, of Leipzig, who has been called the father of the confessional tendency. He declares that a worse mistake in regard to the meaning of the pledge cannot be conceived than to represent it as "involving the obligation to subscribe and recognize as scriptural everything that is contained in the Symbolical Books." He says further: "The Church requires unanimity of her servants in confession. But confession is not something which does not belong to the Confession. Confession is not the explanation, the discussion, the demonstration of the Confession. Confession is the Articles of Faith which our Church designates either as those which she holds in common with other Confessions, or as those by which she distinguishes herself from other Confessions." *

These views touching the authority and obligation of the Confessions represent about the average position of the Symbolists. Certainly, they do not stand for an unqualified and unconditional subscription to the Confessions, but rather to the faith which is found in the Confessions; to "the substance of doctrine," as some of the Symbolists said. This is the view of an

* *Votum über die eidliche Verpflichtung,* 1845, p. 24.

able defender of the Confessions, who wrote at the very time that the controversy over the Confessions and over confessional subscription was in process. Under the heading: *The Practice of the Churches in More Recent Times in Regard to Subscription to the Symbols,* Köllner writes: "The theologians of more recent times almost universally have departed from the rigid doctrine of the Symbols, and indeed, as it is proper to remark, not only those who, in the antagonism of parties, are called *Rationalists, but also those* who oppose them and wish to be regarded as champions of the Church's doctrine.

"On this subject one should see the highly interesting observations and the collection of particular deliverances in Johannsen, p. 577 *et seqq.* Not only have those who, alas! have been sufficiently decried as *heterodox,* abandoned the faith of the Symbols, but even the so-called orthodox, as Döderlein, Morus, Michaelis, the venerable Reinhard, Knapp, Storr, Schott, Schwartz, Augusti, Marheineke, also Hahn, Olshausen, Tholuck and Hengstenberg.

"So, also, the public subscription to the Symbols has been very much modified, and nowhere is it *unconditioned,* but always, true to the Protestant Principle and guarding this, it is made with the expressed proviso that the highest authority belongs to the Scripture, as a glance at the formulae of subscription in the different countries shows." *

And now we turn to Johannsen, as advised to do by Köllner. We find that every one of the theologians named above has, in one point or in another, departed from the teaching of the Confessions, though there are "the dogmatic rigorists," as Guericke, Rudelbach, Harms, Grundtvig, who stand for a closer adherence to the Confessions; but of the writers on systematic theology in this period (1817-1848) it may be said that they show a decided *tendency,* but it can be scarcely said that any of them have reached a fixed confessional goal. They are almost all more or less under the influence of Schleiermacher or Hegel (Marheineke).†

Over against the Symbolists stood the Anti-Symbolists, who contended for greater freedom in regard to confessional subscription. Here Bretschneider was the chief writer, who, as

* *Symbolik der Lutherischen Kirche,* p. 121. In proof of his declaration Köllner quotes numerous subscription formulae in use in his day.

† See Tischhauser, *Geschichte der Evang. Kirche Deutschlands,* p. 654; Frank, *Geschichte und Kritik,* pp. 132 *et seqq,* and p. 166; Seeberg, *Die Kirche Deutschlands im neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* p. 69.

did other Anti-Symbolists generally, denounced the position of the opposite party as *symbol-coercion* (Symbolzwang). He speaks of "our Symbols," and of "the Symbols of our Church." He even declares that "the Church must have a bond of union, and that this is the faith expressed in her Confessions. It is conceded that a Church must have something in common, and that includes the faith, the cultus and the form of government. But the foundation of the faith must be something *simple, general* and *fixed,* not such a collection of finely-spun dogmas as our Church Symbols contain, which separate rather than unite, and start too many doubts."* He insists that the Symbols are too elaborate, and that they contain too many contradictions, to serve as a bond of union. However, the weight of sentiment inclined strongly toward the Symbolists.

5. *The New Lutheranism.*

The phrase, *New Lutheranism,* does not have reference, as the words might suggest, to the introduction of modern theological conceptions into Lutheranism, but to the introduction of conceptions and methods which the Lutheranism of the Reformation had abandoned and condemned. It took for its watchword: *Back to the past.* But its "past" was, in regard to many things, the pre-Reformation era. It maintained that the Reformation had reformed too much, and had abandoned not a few valuable institutions which had grown up in the Church during the mediæval and earlier centuries. For instance, it had laid too much stress on the Church Invisible, and not enough on the Church Visible; it had forged too deep a cleft between the Church and the State; it had given the Word precedence over the sacraments as means of grace; it had departed from the doctrine of transmission in the office of the ministry; it had laid too little stress on confession and absolution.†

In the fourth and fifth decades of the century it was greatly influenced by the literary and Roman Catholic Romanticism of the preceding decades. It might not be improper to call it the *Romanticising* of Lutheranism. It has been called German Puseyism. But it was the Revolution of 1848 that gave it its significance and its influence for nearly a generation. After

* *Unzulässigkeit des Symbolzwangs,* pp. 23-25; *Antwort auf das Libell,* p. 28.

† See Kliefoth, *Acht Bücher von der Kirche,* 1854, *passim. Löhe, Aphorismen; Liturgic,* 2d edition, *Preface.* Frank, *Geschichte und Kritik der Neueren Theologie,* pp. 214 *et seqq.*

that great social and political upheaval the Romanticists in religion conceived it to be one of their missions to defend the throne against all democratic ideas and aspirations: and though they never formed a compact party, they may be described as a politico-ecclesiastical alliance, with decidedly Romanizing tendencies. As a matter of fact, they were led chiefly by Dr. Frederick Julius Stahl, from 1840 professor of ecclesiastical and civil law in the University of Berlin, whose views in regard to the Church and the ministry were both legalistic and Romanizing. He held that the Church is "God's institution over men," and that synods are not to govern the Church, but "to give didactico-official expression to the Church government (*Kirchenregiment*)."

Not a few statesmen, jurists and theologians, who had been frightened by the Revolution, and had conceived hostility for the philosophical speculations which had been introduced into theology, and for certain religious phenomena, had come to think alike in various parts of Germany, and to act in concert for the restoration of "the venerable institutions of the Church," though they were by no means agreed in all points of doctrine. They were, however, agreed in their opposition to Pietism. Kliefoth called Spener an exotic in the Lutheran Church, and declared that he had weakened and torn it by his subjectivism. In general it may be said that the New Lutherans sought to restore the Confessions to somewhat of that rigid obligatory authority which they had in the seventeenth century; that they laid special stress on pure doctrine; that they minimized, and in some instances, sought to obliterate the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines; that they exalted the ministry in its official administration of the means of grace; that they (some, at least) claimed that pastors are the successors of the apostles, and that the sacraments, officially administered, form the central point of Lutheranism; that they held that the sacraments, as means of grace, have a higher significance than the Word; that they regarded the Church as a divine institution, rather than as a congregation of true believers.*

In the department of systematic theology, representatives of this Romanticising tendency produced some noted works. We may name a few: Dr. F. A. Philippi, of Rostock, likened to

* See Dorner, *History of Prot. Theology*, II., 403 *et seqq;* Lichtenberger, *Hist. German Prot. Theol. in 19th Century*, pp. 421 *et seqq;* Kurtz, *Church History*, III., § 175, I.; Seeberg, *Die Kirche Deutschlands*, pp. 138 *et seqq.*

John Gerhard and Quenstedt, published (1854-79) *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre,* very much in the spirit of the Lutheran Confessions and after the manner of the Dogmaticians of the seventeenth century. Thomasius issued his *Christi Person und Werk* (1853-1855), as a statement of the Lutheran Dogmatic, though in numerous points he departs from the doctrinal concepts of the Lutheran Confessions. Kahnis published *Die Lutherische Dogmatik historisch-genetisch dargestellt* (1861-64). On the formal principle of the Reformation, on the person of Christ, on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, he deviates appreciably from the teaching of the Confessions on those subjects. Von Hofmann, of Erlangen, is the author of *Schriftbeweis* (1852-53), a semi-dogmatic, in which the author seeks to demonstrate the agreement of his theology with the Lutheran Confessions; but he called down on himself the wrath of the entire theological Faculty of Rostock in regard to his teaching on the atonement, though he was supported by his colleagues of the Erlangen Theological Faculty. And to these might be added Heinrich Schmid's *"Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt."*

Schmid's work has been thus described by Seeberg: "Valuable as this book is in itself, yet the title is strange and misleading in view of the contents. '*The* Dogmatic' of the Lutheran Church is thus the Dogmatic of the seventeenth century, and the 'sources' 'of *the* Dogmatic' are the works of Gerhard, Calovius and Quenstedt! The especial confusion of the conceptions in regard to the 'old Dogmatic' is aptly expressed by this title. And, finally, justification for this idea—which still exists here and there—rests only on the authority of the Rationalistic theologians. They presented, as already Semler did, a comprehensive statement of the forms of the seventeenth century. They also added critical observations. This last was omitted by Schmid, who gave no reasons for his confidence in the science of the seventeenth century. But such a procedure must, of course, fortify one in the mistake that the seventeenth century was the classic period for the construction of the Lutheran doctrines." *

To this group of distinguished Lutheran theologians, who represent the New Lutheranism, might be added others, equally distinguished, as Delitzsch and Luthardt, of Leipzig, Frank, of Erlangen, and Zöckler, of Greifswald, all of whom were more

* *Ut supra,* p. 140.

or less influenced by the New Lutheranism, and who, together with their contemporaries named above, were known in the second half of the nineteenth century as *confessionalists*.

Now it will be instructive to learn just what the most distinguished representatives of this group have written on the subject of confessional subscription. We will begin with Philippi. In his Lectures on Symbolics, published in 1883 by his son, Dr. Ferdinand Philippi, Professor Philippi says: "When it is said that only actual material agreement with the *doctrine* of a particular Church, as the same is set forth in its confessional writings, can be demanded of a preacher of that Church, it is already understood that, least of all, is such an agreement with the letter of the Symbols to be demanded that also everything that belongs not immediately to the doctrine itself, but only to its exegetical, historical or dogmatic grounding, proof and determination, must be acknowledged as irrefutably correct. For instance, not *every* citation of Holy Scripture which is found in our Symbolical Books always proves that which it is designed to prove. But it is sufficient if the doctrine which is intended to be proved by it is in general only in the Scripture, and has been proved or can be proved by other citations." * "Moreover, that even of teachers only an honest and hearty agreement in all the fundamental articles of the evangelical doctrine should be demanded we have already remarked. Even these (teachers), in a time like our own, when progress is making, may be treated with hope by the Church authorities if they express doubt about the less essential parts of the Church's Confession. These (the Church authorities) may decide in special cases to what extent a person offering himself for the ministry is actually in harmony with the essential ground of the Evangelical Confession. To decide this is the business of intelligent Church authorities. Under such conditions the very promising and well qualified, in regard to whom, according to human judgment and foresight, there is hope for further progress, will not be deterred from the ministry." †

Kahnis, in his *Christentum und Lutherthum* (1871), which was written in opposition to the Prussian Union, says: "When Lutherans lay stress on their Confession, that is not peculiar to them. All other Churches are called confessions, because they have confessions. The peculiarity of the Lutheran Church lies not in the fact *that* it has a confession, but in the Confession

* P. 320.

† P. 324.

which it has. What is that Confession? It is the Augsburg Confession. Lutheran is that congregation, that National Church, which knows itself to be attached to the Augsburg Confession as the confession which normalizes its doctrine. The other confessions of the Book of Concord were never universally accepted in the Lutheran Church, and consequently have only the character of confessions of secondary rank. The original and legal designation of the Lutheran Church is, 'Congregations of the Augsburg Confession.' Where a congregation ceases to confess itself to the Augsburg Confession it loses its Lutheran character. Acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession as the fundamental confession is the first mark of Lutheranism. This acknowledgment is, of course, determined by the principle of Scripture. Thus a Lutheran, who, wholly mistaking the human character of this Confession, would exempt it from all testing, and would declare it to be absolute truth, would ascribe to this Confession a dignity which, on the principle of Protestantism, it cannot have and does not even mean to have. To acknowledge a confession can mean only this: To be convinced of the essential agreement of the same with the Scripture. But a congregation acknowledges a confession then only, when it sees in the same the norm of public teaching. The Reformed churches have no universally authoritative confession, but only territorial symbols, which, of course, cannot have for the Reformed Church as a whole the authority which the Lutheran Church ascribes to her universally recognized chief Symbol. The Union labors under the contradiction of giving equal authority to different confessions.'' *

On the special subject of confessional subscription, Professor Kahnis expressed himself as follows: ''When a Lutheran minister subscribes the Confession he deceives himself and others if he thinks that the Protestant fundamental principle of the unconditional authority of the Scriptures takes away all binding authority from such subscription. The Protest *So Far As* (Quatenus, so far as the Confession is in harmony with the Scriptures) is right only when it stands on *Because* (Quia), because the essential agreement of the Confession with the Scriptures is assured. But we purposely say: The essential. For instance, he who in principle holds the Scriptures as the sole infallible canon of truth, cannot possibly declare the Confession to be infallibly true, because he would then place the Confession

* Pp. 73, 74.

on equal footing with the Scriptures. But the word essential is in need of a more exact definition. The truth of the Confession does *not* stand primarily *on the truth of each* individual proposition. Of the Augsburg Confession, the chief Confession, we do not, indeed, have either the German or the Latin original. As Melanchthon improved the original up to the last moment, so he subsequently also changed much, and this must be really regarded as an improvement, although only the unaltered original form has validity. But that rigid adherence to every statement can lead straight to error is shown, for example, by the well-known statement in the Apology (Art. XIII.) which teaches that there are three sacraments: Baptism, the Lord's Supper and Absolution. Moreover, it is self-evident that he who accepts the Confession acknowledges its content of faith, *not the theological form,* which bears the characteristic of every theology: It is human, liable to be mistaken, influenced by the times. We interpret very differently, we look at history differently and require a different dogmatic definition, development and confirmation of the doctrines of faith from what the Reformers did." *

We pass to Zöckler, who in the third edition of his *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften* writes as follows: "We demand a theology that is governed by the Confession, or, more briefly, that is faithful to the Symbol. It is self-evident that the standpoint here indicated does not exclude the right of free movement and of a critical attitude toward the Symbols of the Church. The theologian of our day who is true to the Confession need not bind himself to the exegetical and historical proofs, which were used by the authors of these writings according to the stage of the sciences in their day. Neither are all the details of their dogmatic construction of obligatory authority for him, nor is he obliged to retain the harsh polemic tone, the anathemas, the 'Damnamus' found in the doctrinal writings of the sixteenth century against those of another faith. The Symbols themselves make no claim to such unconditioned binding authority of their letter. They themselves assign inspired authority only to the Scriptures. Even the most rigid and most sharply defined of the Lutheran Symbols, the Formula of Concord, distinguishes the Symbolical Books as *norma normata* from the Scripture as *norma normans.* This latter is the absolute norm of faith, 'the sole and most certain rule, ac-

* P. 128.

cording to which all dogmas must be explained and all doctrines and teachers must be judged.' This it places high above the other, which is merely a human norm of doctrine. And the modern theological defenders of the good right of the Symbols judge in the same way. Even Dr. Ferdinand Philippi, in his festive publication for the third centennial of the Book of Concord (*Die Notwendigkeit und Verbindlichkeit des Kirchlichen Bekenntnisses, 1880*), declares as obligatory and normative in the Confessions, not their external exegetico-historical attire or the details of their passionate discussions, but their system of doctrine. And not once does he mean that this system of doctrine shall be considered as absolutely perfect, incapable of improvement.'' *

Dr. F. H. R. Frank ranked as one of the most thoughtful and one of the most thoroughly sound Lutheran theologians of the nineteenth century. His monument is his *Theologie der Concordienformel.* When offered the chair made vacant in the University of Berlin by the death of Dr. Dorner, he declined it, because the Prussian Church does not accept the Lutheran Confession to the exclusion of the Reformed. His numerous works show clearly that, while holding firmly by the Lutheran system of doctrines, as antithetical to the Roman Catholic system on the one hand, and equally antithetical on the other to the Reformed system, he did not follow the Lutheran Confessions word for word. The writer hereof stated the case to Dr. Frank in a private letter as it is presented above, and inquired: ''Am I correct in this supposition?'' January 9, 1893, Dr. Frank answered as follows: ''My conception of the sense of subscription to the Symbols of the Lutheran Church you have in general rightly apprehended. We know ourselves at home in our Church not as slaves, who are servilely bound to the letter of the Confessions, much less to the theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but as free and willing sons, who know the meaning of our fathers, and feel ourselves inwardly at one with them. Hence we know how to distinguish between the substance of the Confession, which is to be ascertained historically by reference to the antitheses, and the many accidental additions which unavoidably attach themselves to it and are not

* Band I., 15, 16. *The Lutheran Cyclopedia* describes Zöckler as ''a Lutheran theologian of encyclopaedic learning, as thorough as universal in knowledge, and truly conservative.'' The same authority describes Dr. Ferdinand Philippi as ''a strictly orthodox Lutheran theologian.''

obligatory upon us. To these belong, for instance, the explanations of particular passages of Scripture, as James ii., the lugging in of the Aristotelian categories in the Article on Original Sin, the false citations, and the like."

Superintendent Dr. Koehler, writing on *Subscription to the Scripture and to the Confession,* says: "The pastor, by his office, is bound to preach the Gospel of Christ according to the testimony of Holy Scripture, and according to the way in which it is understood by the Evangelical Church, and to build the congregation on this foundation. As norm and canon in all his official acts the Scripture must be in the first rank, the Confession of the Church in the second. A pledge directed to that end is, in some form, everywhere required of the minister at his entrance into office, either at his ordination or by a special act of obligation. Yet it is to be observed that the obligation to Scripture and to Confession never can have the meaning of consent to the verbal inspiration of the Holy Scripture, or to the juridical obligation to the wording of the Symbol. Scripture and Confession in the Evangelical Church can never become a law to regulate teaching in a juridical manner." *

These examples illustrate the position of the most distinguished Lutheran theologians of the second half of the nineteenth century in relation to the value and authority of the Confessions. The number of such might be greatly increased, but they could add nothing to the clearness and distinctness with which the German Lutheran theologians of the period under review repudiate the proposition that subscription to the Lutheran Confessions involves obligation to hold and to teach all the details of their expositions. It is enough to adhere to their system of doctrine; to be convinced of the essential agreement of the Confessions with the Scriptures; to require actual material agreement on doctrine; to hold by the substance of the Confession. These are the points on which the confessional Lutherans of the second half of the nineteenth century agreed, and it is on such conceptions that almost all the Lutheran systematic theology of the times is based. To be convinced of this, one has only to consult the works named near the beginning of the present section, to which might be added Luthardt's *Kompendium der Dogmatik* and his *Glaubenslehre,* and Frank's *System der Christlichen Wahrheit.*

* *Lehrbuch des Deutsch-Evangelischen Kirchenrechts.* 1895, pp. 183-4. The author was Superintendent and Oberconsistorialrat in Darmstadt.

6. *The Formulae of Subscription.*

The formulae of subscription in force in Germany during the nineteenth century, many of which are in force at the present time, are identical in essence with the views of the so-called Lutheran symbolists and confessionalists of the century. They show that they differ widely from some formulae used in previous centuries, and are not unconditional and absolute, though some of them are more stringent than others. We give a few illustrative examples.

The formula introduced into the Kingdom of Saxony in 1811 reads as follows: "You are to promise and swear that in regard to religion you will steadfastly abide by the pure evangelical doctrine accepted in these lands as the same is contained in the Holy Scripture, is set forth in the unaltered Augsburg Confession and is repeated in the other Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Church, that you will teach accordingly and that against the maintenance of this doctrine you will do nothing either secretly or openly; also when you perceive that others wish to do this, that you will not conceal it, but make it known to the superintendents; and in so far as you shall feel yourself pressed by your conscience to depart in your sermons from the doctrinal system received in the Evangelical Church or to confess to another confession not in harmony with this Confession, without delay, by virtue of your oath, you will announce the same to your superintendents and await further decision on the matter." This was adopted to take the place of an oath prescribed in 1601, which bound not merely with reference to doctrine, but rigidly to faith on the letter of the Symbolical Books.*

In *Saxe-Weimar* the candidates promised (1821) "to preach the Word of God purely as it is contained in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles and according to the Confession of the Evangelical Protestant Church, in so far as these agree with the Word of God."

In *Bavaria* (1821): "The Protestant Evangelical Church holds in due respect the Ecumenical Creeds, and the Symbolical Books in the separate Protestant Confessions, yet it recognizes no other rule of faith or norm of doctrine than alone the Holy Scriptures."

In *Würtemberg* in 1826: "Especially do you promise hereby, in your sermons and religious instructions, to hold yourself to the Holy Scriptures and to allow yourself no deviations from the

* Köllner, I., p. 123.

evangelical system of doctrine in so far as the same is contained especially in the Augsburg Confession."

In *Austria*, since 1788: "I call upon you to witness in the presence of God and of this Christian congregation that you are firmly resolved to assume the office of evangelical teacher, and to administer the same according to the rule of Jesus Christ our Lord, and to preach the Christian religion purely to your congregation according to the content of the Holy Scripture and of the Augsburg Confession."

In *Electoral Hesse* an oath to the Symbolical Books is not required. The preacher, at his ordination, is instructed "to preach purely the entire doctrine of the Christian religion which is taught in the Prophetical and Apostolical Books of the Old and New Testaments, in the Apostles', the Nicene, the Athanasian, the Ephesine and Chalcedonic Creeds, and also is explained in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology."

In *Bavaria*, since 1853: "I, N. N., promise that in my sermons, instructions and other functions, of whatever nature they may be, to hold myself carefully to the doctrine of the Holy Scripture as the same is witnessed to in the Confessions of our Evangelical Lutheran Church, and in no respect knowingly to depart from, to say nothing about contradicting, them; and I will not give offense by uncertain and doubtful doctrines which are not in harmony with the Confession of my Church," etc.

In the *Kingdom of Saxony*, 1871: "I promise before God that I will teach and preach purely, according to best knowledge and conscience, the Gospel of Christ as the same is contained in the Holy Scripture and is witnessed to in the first unaltered Augsburg Confession and in the other Symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."

These examples fairly represent the formulae of subscription employed in the German Lutheran Church during the nineteenth century.* Some of the formulae confine subscription to the

* Those who are in search of further information on this subject will find it in Johannsen, *ut supra*, pp. 608 *et seqq.*; Köllner, *ut supra*, I., 121 *et seqq.*; Hermann Mulert, *Die Lehrverpflichtung*, 2nd ed. (1906); Georg Löber, *Ordinationsverpflichtungen* (1905); also in the very scholarly articles of J. O. Evjen, in *The Lutheran Quarterly* for Jan., April, July, 1907, entitled, *Lutheran Germany and the Book of Concord.* On p. 352, Dr. Evjen writes as follows: "The Lutherans in Europe that do not accept the Book of Concord are: (a) 22,000,000 in Germany (over two-thirds of her entire Lutheran population); (b) 2,500,000 in Denmark (entire State, including Iceland); (c) 2,250,000 in Norway (entire State); (d) 1,289,000 in Hungary (entire Lutheran population); (e) 372,000 in Austria (entire Lutheran population); (f) 60,000 in France (entire Lutheran population); (g) 83,000 in Holland; (h) 400,000 in (Russian) Poland."

Scriptures and to the Augsburg Confession. Very few specifically mention the Formula of Concord. Some employ the words: "According to the content"; in German, *Nach dem Inhalte,* which to a German means: According to the *tenor, substance, substantially.* In some cases the formula is a promise to preach the doctrine *contained* in the Holy Scripture and in the Augsburg Confession, or in the Symbolical Books. In the case of Würtemberg, prominence is given to the evangelical system. In no instance have we found a formula that is unconditional. And as regards the confessional Lutheran theology of the nineteenth century, it is by no means a reproduction of the *Kirchenlehre* of the Book of Concord. It deals also with current theological problems, as witness Kahnis, Luthardt and Frank. Seeberg, in his *Die Kirche Deutschlands im neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* 1903, says that in formulating the doctrines theologically they nearly all deviate from the Confession.* And Gottfried Braun, senior and pastor in Eyrichshof, in an essay which he was "required" to read before the Bavarian Lutheran Synod in 1875, has very accurately voiced the prevailing Lutheran sentiment in the second half of the nineteenth century in what he says on the special subject of subscription to the Confessions and their over-valuation: "If, then, the pledging (Verpflichtung) of the ministers to the Confessions results self-evidently and almost without argument from our premises, so might we here also make a restriction and point to an existing impropriety. The ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church are pledged in general to the Symbols. We have shown above that among them there is an important gradation in symbolical value. Some of them, though they are publicly recognized, are nevertheless private writings and bear wholly the character of such. Melanchthon, for instance, to take only one example from many, in the Apology calls the authors of the Confutation asses, and the Pope the chief of rogues. How strongly Luther laid on the Schmalkald Articles the impress of his robust individuality has been already mentioned. It has occurred recently that a stupid slave of the Symbols sought publicly to justify his irreverent attacks by means of these harsh characteristics of the Schmalkald Articles; and, likewise, a not less stupid enemy of the Symbols undertook to base his cry for the complete abolition of the Symbols on the accidental expressions of the Apology. One of the Confessions, the Formula of Concord, is scarcely any longer to

* P. 235.

be named a Confession, yea, it itself expressly declares that it is not intended to be a confession. Its content lies in by far the largest part beyond the boundary that separates confession from doctrine. If, however, subscription to the Confessions is to be made in bulk, then men who have consciences gravely hesitate. But to those who have no conscience subscription will be a perfect illusion, when it is understood from the beginning that exceptions are to be allowed. This is sought to be met by saying that subscription is not to be made to the form, but to the content, not to the accident, but to the substance, not to the clothing of the evangelical truth emphasized, not to every individual truth, every quotation, every idea, every conception of a biblical passage, not to the non-fundamental, but to the fundamental, to the spirit of the Confessions. In this way the fact is overlooked that, when it is not said what this fundamental, this spirit is, it is left to the candidate to settle this, and in this way—just as with that old quatenus—the door is opened to arbitrariness, and subscription becomes obscure, and, therefore, worthless. In the same way subscription can just as well be made to the Holy Scripture. The incongruity mentioned above is here to blame, namely, that our Confessions have too little the character of the formula, too much that of theological discussions. To the old ecumenical creeds, which are pure formulae, subscription can be made without any hesitation." And he raises the question whether the embarrassment cannot be met "by subscribing only to the Augsburg Confession, instead of to the Symbols in general, since the Augsburg Confession is so preëminently our Confession, as lately has been emphasized by Kahnis in his *Christentum und Luthertum.* It still bears especially the character of a formula, and is freest of all from individual peculiarities, and in its theological expositions enters least of all into detail, and as over against Rome it presents that which is necessary with such classic precision, that subscription to it alone at the same time avoids the unnecessary burdening of the conscience and gives to the Church necessary security." *

Again: "In close connection with what has been said above stands the question of the over-valuation of the Confessions. It is not very easy to define this question clearly, however distinctly we may recognize such over-valuation when it meets us

* Braun, *Unsere Symbole, ihre Geschichte und ihr Recht,* 1875, pp. 59, *et seqq.*

in life. The distinction between *norma normans* and *norma normata* does not lead us very far here; for the main word, *norma,* is everywhere the same. A norm remains a norm, however it became such. Can the Holy Scripture be over-valued? We must unhesitatingly answer, Yes. Only over-valuation is not the proper word. Sticking to the letter with anxious stupidity, instead of allowing one's self to be filled and penetrated by its spirit—such is the most correct way to speak of such a phenomenon. The same perverse practice, which can be pursued in regard to the Scripture, is possible in regard to the Symbols, and has only too often really existed. Above we considered the history of the Lutheran Symbols in the time when reverence for the great struggles of the Reformation degenerated into symbololatry. But in every age, even in the present, the similar phenomenon rises up here and there in circles where the faith expressed in the heart becomes living again. The formal right, the right of the letter, they probably have on their side who take this mistaken course. But they forget that the formal right, the right of the letter, everywhere, and most of all in the realm of the Church, becomes the worst material wrong. When, in § 12, we discussed the subject: The irreligious use of a Confession of religion, we did not deny that in many who thus err there is an erring conscience, which impels them in this course, and that they sincerely think in that way to serve their Lord and his Church. But as little as we dare hide from ourselves the fact that that is not the case in all, so, also, that it is not the new man born of God, but even in the most advanced it is a remnant of the old Adam, which drives them to such a use of the Symbols. The center, both of the Scriptures and of all the Symbols, is Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour. Especially is the center of our Lutheran Symbols justifying faith in this Christ. Whoever now receives this faith, not merely in his understanding, but into his heart, directs his gaze humbly at his own poor, weak heart and to the author and finisher of all faith, and makes his own growth in faith and consequent sanctification his chief aim, but seeks to set his erring brethren right with a gentle and humble spirit, such an one adheres in a truly spiritual way to the Symbols. But whoever imagines himself to be perfect, but then plays the spy so as to see that everywhere the letter of the Symbols is adequately reverenced, and then by rigid interpretation and with everlasting hair-splitting imposes that letter as a canon on all the speeches and actions of the

brethren, and is ready to excommunicate all those who will not accommodate themselves to this burdensome yoke, such an one may be true to the Symbols, but he stands far away from the Lord and His Spirit, whom alone the Symbols delight to honor. Whoever is in truth a disciple of Jesus learns from him, before everything, to be large-hearted, learns to turn from the erection of a perpendicular legality, learns to have regard for the infinite manifoldness of human talents and stages of development, and in the painful matter of excommunication will limit himself to that which is absolutely necessary, to that which concerns the life of the center of the Christian faith. The narrow-hearted letter-slaves of the Symbols think that they advance the interest of the Church by their conduct. They do not see that in that way they only split the church into fragments. When the external unity of the Church was yet maintained by the power of the Princes, it was possible safely to employ symbololatry for the unity of the Church. But now that every external bond in its last vestiges has disappeared, what can be the consequence of such straining of gnats, but the splitting of the Church into a multitude of sects? To people who are inclined to be separatistic that may appear to be an advantage. But the thoughtful friend of the Church can see in it only a great misfortune. But there will be symbol-slaves so long as there is a Church and a Confession, for the tendency in that direction lies deep in human nature. Hence we must bear this evil as we have to bear a thousand others; only we must not allow ourselves to be robbed by this abuse of the Symbols. They are a great and indispensable treasure whose value is not to be diminished by the perverse use which small spirits and proud hearts here and there make of it." *

Even this essay shows that the confessional question was not yet settled at the close of the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Neither was it settled by the close of the century, for Seeberg tells us that "questions are here involved which in the new century will lead to very serious complications and conflicts. What is meant by 'fidelity to the confessions,' and where does real ecclesiastical difference in regard to Confession begin—in formulating theological doctrines almost all differ from it, these are the difficult questions which will yet frequently engage the attention of the Church and of theology. The solution will have to be justified not only according to the history of dogma and

* *Ibid.* pp. 63-65.

by dogma: it must also be made plain and be made evident to the common man.'' *

The Scandinavian States received the Reformation at an early date. As early as 1520 Christian II., of *Denmark*, put himself in communication with Wittenberg, and sought from the school of Luther a capable and learned man ''to purify religion and to lead the ministry again from the authority of the State to the service of the Church.'' The Church Order of 1537 recognized only the Holy Scriptures as the norm for faith, ''God's pure Word, which is the Law and the Gospel.'' Frederick II. († 1588) looked upon the Book of Concord, which his relative Elector August of Saxony sent him to lay before the Danish theologians, as a disturber of peace and unity. He not only refused to lay it before his theologians, but prohibited the sale of it in Denmark and threatened to depose all ministers in whose possession the work should be found. In 1665 the *lex regia* of Frederick III. stipulated that the Augsburg Confession of 1530 should be the creed of the king as the Supreme Head of the Danish Church. And by the laws of Christian V. (1683) the Word of God, the Ecumenical Creeds, the unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechism were made obligatory for the clergy. These, then, are the only symbols in the Book of Concord which Denmark has ever recognized. The Book of Concord, though never officially recognized in Denmark, has, however, been translated into the Danish language, and has been highly esteemed by some Danish theologians. The formula of subscription (1870) reads as follows: ''I promise that I will be diligent in preaching the Word of God in its truth and purity as contained in the Prophetical and Apostolic writings and in the Symbolical Books of our Danish Evangelical-Lutheran Church. . . .'' †

So long as *Norway* was united with Denmark, 1536-1814, the ecclesiastical laws of the one country were much the same as those of the other. The Church of Norway has never, either before or after the dissolution of the Union, subscribed to any other symbols than has the Church of Denmark. Of the post-Reformation symbols thus only two are recognized as Symbolical Books of the Norwegian Church: the Augsburg Confession and Luther's small Catechism. The ministers promise in their ordina-

* Seeberg, p. 235, *ut supra.*

† Fr. Nielsen, Art. Danmark, in *Kirke-Lexicon for Norden,* Aarhus, 1900, vol. I., 596 *et seqq.*

tion vow that they "will faithfully preach the divine doctrines contained in the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles and in the Symbolical Books of the Norwegian Lutheran Church." The Book of Concord was translated into Norwegian in 1868. Norway enjoys the reputation of being strongly confessional. Her attitude to the symbols, however, is by no means servile. This is evinced by the fact that at the well-known ecclesiastical conference convened in 1908 to draw up a constitution of the Norwegian Church reorganized on a more democratic basis, several eminent clergymen, no less known for piety than for learning and confessional orthodoxy, advocated the shelving of the Nicene and Athanasian Symbols, and a qualified subscription to the Augsburg Confession if the words *rite vocatus,* Art. xiv., apply only to clergymen, thus excluding laymen. A country where such an advocation is respectfully listened to, will of course hold its own against any possible, but improbable, attempt to foist the Book of Concord upon it. The same thing may be affirmed of Denmark, in whose noted Church Lexicon for the North some astonishment is expressed at the fact that the Swedish Augustana Synod (1900), of the General Council in America, obligates her ministers to the entire Book of Concord.*

In *Sweden,* the work of Reformation was begun as early as 1520, by Olaus Petri. In 1527, the Swedish Church was severed from Rome and from the canonical law. At the Council of Westeras, in 1544, additional Catholic ordinances and usages were abolished. In 1593, the first effort was made to organize the Church on a complete Protestant basis. At the Council of Upsala, in 1593, all pledged themselves to stand "by the pure word of God, the three Symbols and the unaltered Augsburg Confession." The Church law of 1686 introduced the Book of Concord as symbolical. In the Constitution of 1809, mention is made only of the Council of Upsala and of the Augsburg Confession. "This uncertainty as to whether the entire Book of Concord has symbolical authority in Sweden or not, has evoked lively controversies in the Church (especially in 1893), and the end has not yet been reached." † In the present formula of subscription, formulated in 1903, the clergyman promises "to proclaim in its purity, according to his best knowledge and conscience, the Word of God as it is given in Holy Scriptures and as it is testified to by the Confessional books of our Church." ‡

* *Kirke-Lexicon for Norden* III., 397; I. 175.

† *Realencyclopädie,*[3] Art. *Schweden.* By Hjalmar Holmquist.

‡ For further information on the confessional relations of the Scandi-

It may be well to turn to two eminent theologians and prelates, respectively of the Danish and of the Swedish Lutheran Church, to find what they have expressed as their views in regard to the obligatory power of the Symbols, which was discussed contemporaneously in Germany. Says Bishop Martensen: "If, now, poraneously in Germany. Says Bishop Martensen. "If, now, we ask in what sense ecclesiastical symbols have a canonical character in relation to dogmatics, the answer is, they have it as being *normae normatae,* or QUIA et QUATENUS *cum sacra scriptura consentiunt.* By the first of these specifications (*quia*) we would indicate the essential *oneness* of church doctrines with the biblical doctrines; by the second (*quatenus*), that there is nevertheless a relative *difference* between the ecclesiastical and the Christian, between the letter of the symbols and their spirit, between the form and idea. Accordingly, in announcing that we intend to adhere not only to the ecumenical symbols, but also to the creed of the Lutheran Church, particularly as this is given in the Augsburg Confession, we mean thereby that we intend to hold to the *type* of sound doctrine, which is therein contained, being convinced that we are in this way most sure of preserving our connection with the Apostolic Church. We do not regard the Lutheran Confession as a work of inspiration; yet no more do we regard it as a mere work of man, inasmuch as the age of the Reformation had a special vocation to bear testimony and put forth confessions, just as had those periods of the Church in which the earlier creeds were formed. We make a distinction between type and formula. By the *type* of Lutheranism we mean its ground form, its inextinguishable, fundamental and distinctive features. . . . Whereas the theological *formulae* in which this form is expressed are more or less characterized by relativity and transitoriness." *

And Bishop von Scheele: "By means of this connection of *quia* and *quatenus* the subscriber expresses his conviction that in the essential thing there prevails perfect agreement between the Scripture and the Confession, which he *subscribes,* but on the other side he preserves his independence in regard to all things not essential, that is, in regard to that which does not belong to the fundamental character, to the ecclesiastical type presented in the Symbols." †

navian States, see Articles on Denmark and Sweden in *Realencyclopädie;* the article: Evjen, *The Scandinavians and the Book of Concord, The Lutheran Quarterly* for April, 1906; Köllner, I., 121, 122; Johannsen, pp. 608 *et seqq.*

* *Christian Dogmatics,* § 28.

† *Theologische Symbolik* (1886), I., 31.

Again: "A Church, which in truth claims the name Evangelical Lutheran, and wishes to perpetuate it, must firmly maintain the principle that subscription to the doctrine fixed by the Church does not have reference to the letter, but only to the *particular type of Christianity* which is expressed, and this, for the reason that we know and are certain that it (the type of doctrine) is, in all that is essential, true and genuine, and hence that it cannot be surrendered without at the same time surrendering Christianity itself." *

* *Ut Supra,* II., 81.

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE CONFESSIONS IN AMERICA.

LUTHERAN congregations were established in America as early as the seventeenth century. Their members came from Sweden, Holland and Germany. There can be no doubt that they brought with them the determination to adhere to the Lutheran Confessions, though the precise sense in which they subscribed the Confessions is not now a matter of record. We know, however, that the instruction given in 1642 to Governor Printz, of New Sweden, by the Swedish Crown, was as follows: "Above all things, shall the Governor consider and see to it that a true and due worship, becoming honor, laud and praise, be paid to the Most High God in all things, and to that end all proper care shall be taken that divine service be jealously performed according to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Council of Upsala, and the ceremonies of the Swedish Church; and all persons, but especially the young, shall be duly instructed in all the articles of their Christian faith, and all good discipline shall in like manner be duly exercised and received." The pastors and congregations of Dutch extraction subscribed the Amsterdam Church Order, which pledged the congregations to the unaltered Augsburg Confession. This Amsterdam Church Order had existed since 1597. Later it included all the Symbolical Books. The position of the Germans is clearly indicated in the title of one of their Church Books, which is: "Church Book of the Church of the Germans who embrace the Augsburg Confession." We also know that at least some of the German pastors, as, for instance, Muhlenberg in 1739 and Brunnholtz in 1744, had, at their ordination, pledged themselves to all of the Symbolical Books, and some, if not all those sent from Halle, were commissioned "to teach the Word of God in public and in private, pure and uncorrupt, according to the rule and guidance of the Holy Scriptures and also of the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church." But these, as a matter of course, had the Pietistic conception of the Symbolical Books. They were not confessionalists.

1. *The Older Organizations.*

In August, 1748, six Lutheran ministers and a number of laymen met in Philadelphia, and organized the first Lutheran Synod in America, though an attempt had been made to organize one in New York in 1735. The Philadelphia organization has been generally known as the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, though changes have been made in the name. This first permanent Lutheran organization did not proclaim a constitution, neither did it formally declare its relations to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. But it did two things that clearly indicated that it meant to be Lutheran: It ordained, in 1748, John Nicholas Kurtz, to the ministry, who obligated himself to teach in his congregation "nothing, whether publicly or privately, but what harmonizes with the Word of God and the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. . . ." Also: "The invited preachers and delegated elders of our United Congregations," Sunday, August 14th, 1748, consecrated St. Michael's Church, Philadelphia, when one of the preachers, presumably Muhlenberg, called to mind "that the foundation stones of this church had been laid with the intention that in it the Evangelical Lutheran doctrine, according to the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, and the unaltered Augsburg Confession and all the other Symbolical Books should be taught. . . ." *

In some of the charters and constitutions of local congregations of those and of subsequent days, we find that besides the Augsburg Confession "the other Symbolical Books" are named as confessional basis. But in a still larger number the pastors are required to preach the Word of God as given by Prophets and Apostles, "and in accordance with the unaltered Augsburg Confession." In the constitution of St. Michael's, Philadelphia, 1762, it is declared that the ministers shall "declare the Word of God publicly, in a pure, brief, plain, solid and edifying manner, according to the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, and the unaltered Augsburg Confession." In the Constitution of the Ministerium, "in force in 1781," it is declared that "every minister professes that he holds the Word of God and our Symbolical Books in doctrine and life." † And in 1783 the Ministerium voted to grant license "for preaching

* *Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania,* pp. 7, 21.

† *Documentary History,* p. 175.

and the baptism of children'' to a candidate on condition of his signing a ''revers'' ''to preach the Word of God in its purity, according to Law and Gospel, as it is explained in its chief points in the Augsburg Confession and the other Symbolical Books.'' *

But all this is general. In not a single instance have we discovered that the Ministerium stated specifically how the Confessions are to be received and understood. Indeed, it has been seriously questioned whether ''the exaction of a promise to conform to the Symbolical Books *was ever* habitual.'' † And it is certain that during the later years of the eighteenth century the Confessions fell into general, if not total, desuetude for ordination. Muhlenberg was now dead (1787) and German Rationalism had invaded the ranks of its ministry, so that in the Constitution of 1792 there is absolutely no allusion to any Lutheran symbolical book. Candidates are required, at their ordination, ''to preach the Word of God in its purity according to the law and the gospel.'' This Constitution was republished in 1813 and again in 1841, but still without allusion to any Lutheran symbolical book. In the liturgy published by the Ministerium, in the year 1818, the form for ordination does not obligate to any symbolical book, and the formula of distribution in the Lord's Supper is certainly not that of the Lutheran Church. The Constitution of the New York Ministerium, 1816, declares: ''We establish it as a fundamental rule of this association, that the person to be ordained shall not be required to make any other engagement than this, that he will faithfully teach, as well as perform all other ministerial duties, and regulate his walk and conversation according to the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as contained in the Holy Scripture, and that he will observe this constitution, while he remains a member of this Ministerium.'' ‡ This same declaration is retained in the amended Constitution of 1836,§ and in the ordination service of the contemporaneous liturgy of this Ministerium there is absolutely no reference to any Lutheran symbolical book, and candidates are asked if they are satisfied that ''the Scriptures contain a full account of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ and of all things necessary for eternal salvation.'' But it is not said what the Scriptures are, nor who the Lord Jesus Christ is. In 1856 a third edition of the Constitution was pub-

* *Ut supra*, p. 188.
† S. S. Schmucker, *Lutheran Church in America*, p. 173.
‡ P. 20.
§ P. 16.

lished with the "fundamental rule" unchanged. The fact is that during the first half of the nineteenth century not a few pastors of these two ministeriums had departed from some of the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Confessions and had gone over to the ranks of the Rationalists and Socinians.*

And in addition the Ministerium of Pennsylvania had become decidedly unionistic. In 1836 this Ministerium "resolved that we feel it our duty to provide as much as possible for closer union of the churches of our Lord Jesus Christ, and a perfect union of the Evangelical Lutheran and the Evangelical Reformed Church might be followed by the most blessed advantages." Two years later the Ministerium considered the advisability of publishing "an evangelical paper common to both churches in our country, the Lutheran and Reformed," and resolved,

"1. That the publication of such a paper is loudly and emphatically demanded by the wants of our Church.

"2. That a paper common to the interests of both the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, and sustained by both, is highly desirable." And it was quite the custom for the Ministerium, at its conventions, to introduce Presbyterian, Baptist and Reformed clergymen "as advisory members." †

And that the same body continued in the attitude of neglect of the employment of the Confessions until beyond the middle of the nineteenth century, is shown by the fact that its liturgy, published in 1842 in coöperation with the Synod of New York and the Synod of Ohio, contains no pledge to any confession; and also by the representation of the Reverend W. J. Mann, D. D.: "The Synod does not require its applicants for membership to subscribe the Augsburg Confession, but receives candidates by examination and a colloquy, and members of any other Lutheran ministerium, upon the presentation of an honorable dismissal from the body with which they stood last connected, without further inquiry concerning their orthodoxy." ‡ Finally, in 1860, the body returned to the interpretation of the Scriptures as given in the confessional writings of our Evangelical Lutheran Church, especially in the unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism,§ and in 1863 it is said:

* S. S. Schmucker, *Lutheran Church in America*, pp. 175 *et seqq.*, 201-205.
† See the Minutes for 1822, p. 16; 1823, p. 15; 1839, p. 5; 1841, pp. 9, 11.
‡ *Lutheranism in America*, 1857, p. 88.
§ Minutes for 1860, p. 45.

"The Synod confesses to all canonical books of the Old and New Testaments according to the explanation of the same given in the Confessions of our Evangelical Lutheran Church, namely, in the unaltered Augsburg Confession and in Luther's Small Catechism," * and in 1867 the Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, the Large Catechism and the Formula of Concord were added.†

Thus during a period of more than sixty years the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, sometimes called the Synod of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States, gave no official recognition to the Augsburg Confession, nor to the other Lutheran symbols, and employed no confessional test of orthodoxy, and during much of that time it earnestly sought to effect union with the Reformed Church. Many of her clergy had also strayed from the doctrines of the Lutheran Confession.

The entire situation, during the period which we have briefly sketched, beginning with the year 1748, is stated comprehensively by the late Prof. S. S. Schmucker, D. D. (1799-1873), in the following propositions:

"1. The patriarchs of our Church did at first practically profess the former Symbolical Books of our Church in Germany, by avowing then, or in most instances, the Augsburg Confession at the erection of their houses of worship and in various cases at the induction of men into the ministerial office.

"2. They soon relaxed from the rigor of symbolical requisition, and referred only to the Augsburg Confession, generally omitting all reference to the former Symbolical Books, except the use of the Smaller Catechism of Luther in the instruction of the rising generation.

"3. Neither they nor their successors ever formally adopted these Symbolical Books as binding on our Church in this country, as tests of admission or discipline.

"4. About the beginning of this [19th] century they ceased, in fact, to require assent even to the Augsburg Confession at licensure and ordination, and demanded only faith in the Word of God, thus practically rejecting (as they had a right to do) all the Symbolical Books as tests; though still respecting and occasionally referring to the Augsburg Confession as a substantial exposé of the doctrines which they taught." ‡

* *Synodal Ordnung,* 1863, p. 3.

† *Constitution,* p. 4.

‡ *The American Lutheran Church* (1851), pp. 157-8. See also by the same author: *The Church of the Redeemer,* pp. 88-93.

2. *The General Synod.*

The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States is the child of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, which at its convention in Harrisburg in 1818 resolved to sketch a plan for the closer union of the different Lutheran Synods in the United States. At Baltimore in 1819 the Ministerium adopted a plan of union, known as the *Plan-Entwurf*. As the Ministerium was at that time confessionless, we are not surprised to find that it contains no reference to any Lutheran Confession, though the Small Catechism of Luther and the liturgy of 1818 were "to continue in public use at pleasure." The effort made by the Reverend G. Shober, special delegate from the Synod of North Carolina, to have the Augsburg Confession recognized in the Plan was defeated by the members of the committee from the Ministerium. The General Synod was organized at Hagerstown, Maryland, in 1820. The Constitution adopted makes no recognition of any Lutheran Confession; but it declared that the General Synod shall not have power to prescribe "uniform ceremonies of religion for every part of the Church;" nor shall it introduce changes in matters of faith which might burden the consciences of brethren in Christ. The reason for this extremely liberal and confessionless condition of the General Synod at its organization is found in the fact that the representatives of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania outnumbered the representatives of the three other synods, and in the fact that the said Ministerium had been meditating a more comprehensive union. Even while a member of the General Synod, the Ministerium "*resolved*, That a committee of Synod be appointed to consult in the fear of God on the propriety of a proposition for a general union of our Church in this country with the Evangelical Reformed Church, and the possibility and the proper manner of carrying out eventually such a proposition."* Also in its action dissolving its connection with the General Synod in 1823, the said Ministerium expressed a desire to enter into closer connection with the Reformed, and to call such connection "a union of the German Protestant Church."† As the Ministerium of New York did not send delegates to the General Synod after the meeting for organization, and as the Ministerium of Pennsylvania withdrew in 1823, the Lutheran Confessional consciousness that resided in the remaining synods had the opportunity and the power at once to express itself in

* See *Minutes*, 1822, p. 16.

† *Minutes*, 1823, p. 15.

the recognition of the Augsburg Confession and in the declaration that "this General Synod disclaims the intention to form a union of different denominations"—a determination to which the body has always adhered.

The General Synod had now entered on a new career. At its meeting in Frederick, Maryland, in 1825, it resolved forthwith to establish a theological seminary "which shall be exclusively devoted to the glory of our divine Redeemer, Jesus Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever," thus at once making a protest against the Socinianism that had crept into the two Ministeriums which had severed relations with the body. It was further declared that "in this seminary shall be taught in the German and English languages, the fundamental doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures as contained in the Augsburg Confession." The oath for the professors in the said seminary prescribed at this same time, was as follows: "I do *ex animo* believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the inspired Word of God and the only perfect rule of faith and practice. I believe the Augsburg Confession and the Catechisms of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God."

Thus had the General Synod become *Lutheran* in reality, and deserves even higher commendation than is bestowed in the following paragraph: "The General Synod was a protest against the Socinianizing tendency in New York, and the schemes of a union with the Reformed in Pennsylvania and with the Episcopalians in North Carolina. It stood for the independent existence of the Lutheran Church in America, and the clear and unequivocal confession of a positive faith. It failed, as its founders in the several synods had failed, in specifically determining the contents of this faith. It was not ready yet, as these synods were not ready, to return to the foundations laid by Muhlenberg and his associates, and from which there had been a general recession from twenty-five to thirty years before. Lament defects as we may, the General Synod saved the Church, as it became anglicized, from the calamity of the type of doctrine which, with the New York Ministerium, had been introduced into the English language. It had an outlook that included in its sweep the entire Church in all its interests, as the reports on the state of the Lutheran Church, in the various synods and throughout the world, appended to its minutes, show." *

* Jacobs, *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, p. 362.

In 1829 the General Synod adopted a Constitution for the government of district synods. This Constitution required candidates for ordination to answer affirmatively to the question: "Do you believe that the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession?" It was also declared that "the directory for the government of individual congregations and the constitution for synods and that of the General Synod are parts of one entire system of Lutheran Church government," and as such the three documents were printed together in the Minutes of 1829.

In 1868 the General Synod changed her doctrinal basis to "the Word of God as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word." This is still (1909) the doctrinal basis of the General Synod. Hence it can be said that the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church has returned fully "to the foundations laid by Muhlenberg and his associates." The General Synod has advanced even beyond them; for they made no *explicit* official declaration in regard to the Lutheran Confessions as to what they are or as to what they teach; and from about the year 1762 they founded nearly all their churches on the Word of God and on the Augsburg Confession without making any reference whatever to the other Lutheran Confessions. Thus they regarded the Word of God and the Augsburg Confession as furnishing a sufficient basis for the Lutheran Church, as has been the case ever since the Augsburg Confession was delivered to the Emperor Charles V., in the year 1530, though the Small Catechism has been almost everywhere authorized and used as a manual of instruction for the young, which has been and is still done by the General Synod.

3. *The General Council.*

In 1866 *The German Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States,* otherwise known as the Synod of Pennsylvania, and the Pennsylvania Synod, withdrew from the General Synod and appointed a committee "to prepare and issue a fraternal address to all Evangelical Lutheran Synods, ministers and congregations in the United States and the Canadas, which confess the *Unaltered* Augsburg Confession, in-

viting them to unite in a convention for the purpose of forming a Union of Lutheran Synods."* In response to this invitation, representatives of thirteen Lutheran Synods met in Reading, Pennsylvania, December 12-14, 1866, and adopted certain *Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity,* which are held "of necessity presupposed in any genuine union of Evangelical Lutheran Synods:

"I. There must be and abide through all time, one holy Christian Church, which is the assembly of all believers, among whom the Gospel is purely preached, and the Holy Sacraments are administered as the Gospel demands. To the true Unity of the Church, it is sufficient that there be agreement touching the doctrine of the Gospel that it be preached in one accord, in its pure sense, and that the Sacraments be administered conformably to God's Word.

"II. The true Unity of a particular Church in virtue of which men are truly members of one and the same Church, and by which any Church abides in real identity, and is entitled to a continuation of her name, is unity in doctrine and faith and in the sacraments, to wit: That she continues to teach and set forth, and that her true members embrace from the heart, and use the articles of faith and the sacraments as they were held and administered when the Church came into distinctive being and received a distinctive name.

"III. The Unity of the Church is witnessed to, and made manifest in, the solemn, public and official confessions which are set forth, to wit: The generic Unity of the Christian Church in the general Creeds, and the specific Unity of pure parts of the Christian Church in their specific Creeds; one chief object of both classes of which Creeds is, that Christians who are in the Unity of faith may know each other as such, and may have a visible bond of fellowship,

"IV. That Confessions may be such a testimony of Unity and bond of Union, they must be accepted in every statement of doctrine, in their own true, native, original and only sense. Those who set them forth and subscribe them, must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand those words in one and the same sense.

"V. The Unity of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as a portion of the holy Christian Church, depends upon her abiding in one and the same faith, in confessing which she obtained

* *Appendix to Minutes,* 1866, p. 23.

her distinctive being and name, her political recognition, and her history.

"VI. The Unaltered Augsburg Confession is by preëminence the confession of that faith. The acceptance of its doctrines and the avowal of them without equivocation or mental reservation, make, mark and identify that Church, which alone in the true, original, historical and honest sense of the term is the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

"VII. The only Churches, therefore, of any land, which are properly in the Unity of that Communion, and by consequence entitled to its name, Evangelical Lutheran, are those which sincerely hold and truthfully confess the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession.

"VIII. We accept and acknowledge the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession in its original sense as throughout in conformity with the pure truth of which God's Word is the only rule. We accept its statements of truth as in perfect accordance with the Canonical Scriptures: We reject the errors it condemns, and believe that all which it commits to the liberty of the Church of right belongs to that liberty.

"IX. In thus formally accepting and acknowledging the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, we declare our conviction that the other Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, inasmuch as they set forth none other than its system of doctrine, and articles of faith, are of necessity pure and scriptural. Preeminent among such accordant, pure and scriptural statements of doctrine, by their intrinsic excellence, by the great and necessary ends for which they were prepared, by their historical position, and by the general judgment of the Church, are these: The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Schmalkald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther and the Formula of Concord, all of which are, with the Unaltered Augsburg, in the perfect harmony of one and the same scriptural faith."

The majority of the synods that adopted the *Fundamental Principles,* printed above, completed an organization at Fort Wayne, Indiana, November 20-26, 1867, which bears the official title: *The General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America.* Of the *Fundamental Principles,* or doctrinal basis of the General Council, it may be said that it binds to the very words of the Symbols, and makes no distinction between their form and their substance, and virtually it places them on a level of authority with the Holy Scriptures, since it declares

that "the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, in its original sense, is throughout in conformity with the pure truth of which God's Word is the only rule;" for if it be throughout in conformity with the pure truth of God's Word, then it must have the same authority as God's Word, for things that are throughout in conformity with each other must have the same value and authority. Certainly in binding power this basis surpasses anything of the kind now in force in any other existing body of Lutherans, and is entirely inconsistent with the views of the eminent Lutheran theologians quoted above in Chapter XXX., and with the formulae of subscription and doctrinal statements exhibited in the same chapter.

But whatever may have been the reason, the General Council did not succeed in gathering to itself all the Lutherans in North America who confess "the Unaltered Augsburg Confession." Not all the synods represented in the preliminary organization at Reading, in 1866, sent delegates to help to complete the organization at Fort Wayne, nor has its Lutheran soundness been acknowledged by all Lutheran bodies which, like itself, pledge themselves to all the Lutheran Confessions, and some synods which, at different times have joined themselves to the General Council, have seceded. Besides, the body was confronted at Fort Wayne with what has come to be known as "the four points."

"1. *What relation will this venerable body in the future sustain to Chiliasm?*

"2. *Mixed Communion?*

"3. *The exchanging pulpits with sectarians?*

"4. *Secret or unchurchly societies?*" *

Those who propounded the questions have not been satisfied with the answers that have been rendered by the General Council, nor with its practice in regard to the principles which they are supposed to involve; and some of the subjects named have produced much controversy and alienation within the General Council itself, as especially the so-called Galesburg Rule: "I. The Rule, which accords with the Word of God and with the Confessions of our Church is: Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran ministers only. Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only. II. The exceptions to the rule belong to the sphere of *privilege*, not of *right*. III. The determination of the *exceptions* is to be made in consonance with these principles, by the conscientious

* Minutes, p. 12.

judgment of pastors, as the cases arise.'' * The German ministers of the General Council have strongly inclined to place stress on the word ''only,'' and to interpret the ''Rule'' rigidly, while the ministers of American birth and education have inclined to make ''exceptions.'' And as to the theology taught in the General Council, it is essentially the Dogmatic of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as is shown by *A Summary of the Christian Faith.* By Henry Eyster Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., Norton Professor of Systematic Theology, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, 1905.

4. *The Synodical Conference.*

This body, popularly known as the ''Missourians,'' because it is an accretion round the Missouri Synod, was organized in the year 1872. In several spheres of Christian activity it is wide-awake and aggressive, and is exceedingly zealous for ''the pure doctrine.'' Its critics declare that its one-sided and almost exclusive devotion to Dogmatic, and its consequent relative neglect of Exegesis and History, must sooner or later bring about its dissolution. Certainly it has not been able to retain all the synods that have entered into organic relation with it, and it has been exceedingly controversial towards other synods, which, like itself, acknowledge all the Lutheran Confessions. Its general character has been described by (supposedly) a professor in the Lutheran (General Council) Theological Seminary, near Philadelphia, as follows:

''The Synodical Conference has failed to become, and probably was never intended to become, a general union of Lutheran synods in America. It has simply been a training school to prepare synods for being absorbed by Missouri. As an organization it has no significance for the future development of our Church. It has cut itself entirely loose from the historical development of the Lutheran Church in this country, and from that in Europe for the latter centuries. According to its conception, the Lutheran Church is a stream which, after becoming a mighty river, and running with wide sweep through a century, plunged underground, and for three centuries passed through a hidden channel (sending up a few springs here and there to mark its track), until at last it emerged into the light of day once more in this country, with the arrival on these shores of a devoted band of Saxon emigrants.'' †

* *Minutes* for 1875, p. 17; also *Minutes* for 1876.
† *The Lutheran,* January 15, 1891.

The doctrinal basis of the Synodical Conference is stated in these words: "The Synodical Conference confesses the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God, and the Confession of 1580, called 'Concordia,' as its own" * —meaning by "Concordia," the entire Book of Concord. Every candidate at his ordination declares: "I recognize the three Ecumenical Creeds of the Church, the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and its Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, the two Catechisms of Luther and the Formula of Concord, as the pure, unadulterated explanation and statement of the Divine Word and Will: I confess them as my own confessions and will exercise my ministry unto the end faithfully and diligently according to them." †

As this formula of confession to all the Lutheran Symbolical Books is *absolute* and *unqualified,* it might be supposed that the Synodical Conference (Missourians) could and would maintain perfect ecclesiastical and doctrinal harmony with other Lutheran bodies which likewise make unqualified subscription to the same Confessions. But such is not the case. In reality they have been and still are in most violent disagreement with such, which condition arises from the fact that they do not interpret the Confessions as others do. Among "the false doctrines" which they charge against the General Council are the following:

1. The exchange of pulpits with non-Lutheran ministers.
2. Open Communion, that is, the admission of non-Lutherans to the Lord's Table.
3. The toleration of secret or unchurchly societies, such as Free Masons, Odd Fellows, etc.
4. Chiliasm, Synergism and the toleration of Calvinistic views of the Lord's Supper.
5. Church government, in that the General Council is interpreted as holding that synodical resolutions are *binding* on the congregation, while the Missourians maintain that such resolutions are only *advisory.*

Against the large independent German Iowa Synod, which "accepts unreservedly all the Lutheran Symbols as they have been laid down in the Book of Concord of 1580," ‡ the Missourians charge as "false doctrines," "the open questions," that is, according to the definition of the Iowans, "questions about which there can be different understanding without church fellowship being thereby destroyed, as a question about which *in the con-*

* *Constitution.* † *Liturgy,* p. 240. ‡ *The Lutheran Cyclopedia,* p. 503.

fessional writings of our Church, no symbolical decisions have yet been laid down. Wherefore two views may exist together in our Church.'' * The Missourians deny that there are any such questions for Lutherans, and point to Articles VII. and VIII. of the Augsburg Confession, and to the Schmalkald Articles, Part III., Article XII., and declare: ''In her confession our Church has recorded for all time what she believes, teaches and confesses. For the very reason that no controversy may arise concerning the question what our Church believes and confesses in reference to certain points, or that such controversy may at least be adjusted without difficulty. Thus, for instance, the Formula of Concord in its second part expressly declares as its object that in setting forth its views 'a public and *positive* testimony might be furnished, *not only to those who are now living,* but *also to posterity,* showing what the *unanimous opinion and judgment* of our churches *were,* and PERPETUALLY OUGHT TO BE concerning those controverted articles.' '' †

Among the open questions, according to the Iowans, are the following:

1. *Chiliasm,* which Missouri rejects in its subtle as well as in its grosser forms, while Iowa holds that not every form of Chiliasm is to be rejected.

2. *Antichrist,* Missouri affirming that the Roman Pontiff is antichrist, while Iowa holds that he is an individual yet to come.

3. *The Church,* Missouri holding that the Church is invisible, while Iowa holds that the Church has both a visible and an invisible side.

4. *The Ministry,* Missouri maintaining that ''the holy ministry is the authority conferred by God through the congregation as the possessor of the priesthood and of all ecclesiastical authority, to exercise in behalf of the congregation in a public way the rights of the priesthood.'' ‡ While Iowa declares: ''The theory of transference, according to which individual spiritual priests transfer to one from their midst for public use the rights belonging to themselves, is to be treated purely as a theological problem'' §—an open question.

5. Subscription to the Confessions of the Church. Missouri

* *Erklärung des Ministeriums,* 1859.
† *Controversy on Predestination,* p. 5.
‡ Walther's *Kirche u. Amt.,* p. 354.
§ *Minutes,* 1875, p. 21.

maintaining that a person who subscribes to the Confessions unequivocally, thereby declares his acceptance of all the doctrines contained in them, while Iowa declares that the doctrine to be of binding force must be expressly stated, and not only occasionally mentioned. Hence distinction is to be made between the doctrines contained in the Symbolical Books.

Such are the principal "false doctrines" alleged by the Missourians against two Lutheran bodies, which, like itself, subscribe the Confessions without any expressed reservation, and without distinction between form and substance. They may all be regarded as strictly and rigidly confessional. In the language employed in the Lutheran Church in Germany three generations ago, they can be properly called *Symbolists*. But they stand apart from each other and do not agree as to the teaching of the Confessions which they subscribe. And yet it will be seen that not a single one of the points of difference touches the *heart* or *center* of Lutheranism, but they all belong to its periphery, and cannot be shown to belong to the essence of Christianity. A Christian must be regarded as a *Lutheran* who holds the following chief doctrines in contradistinction to their well-known Calvinistic and other theological antitheses:

That salvation has its source in the paternal *love* of God; that Jesus Christ, very God and very man, is the center of the Evangelical System, and died for the whole race of mankind; that salvation is sincerely offered to all men who hear the Gospel; that the cause of the condemnation of some men who hear the Gospel is their own voluntary rejection of the offer of salvation; that the Word of God and the sacraments offer grace to all alike, and actually convey grace to all who receive them with faith; that Christ is present in the Eucharist; that original sin is truly sin, as against Pelagius and some others; that justification is by grace for Christ's sake through faith alone, as against the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on this subject; that all ministers of the Gospel, whether Presbyterially or Episcopally ordained, are *equal,* as against the views of some sacerdotically constituted churches. The Christian who holds those doctrines as they are fundamentally and principiantly laid down in the Augsburg Confession is a *Lutheran,* and is entitled to be regarded as a *Lutheran,* and to have all the rights, privileges and immunities of a Lutheran conceded to him according to the Peace of Augsburg, the great Magna Charta of Lutheranism, even though he do not hold certain *circumferential* doctrines and

certain just and probable inferences just as Luther and Melanchthon held them, and may not accept certain *explanations* of Lutheran doctrines as they have been presented in the Apology, or in the Schmalkald Articles or in the Formula of Concord, for none of these three is at this time or has ever been universally accepted and subscribed by the entire Lutheran Church. Moreover, it must be remembered that each of these belongs to a specific exigency and that it necessarily bears the marks of its own specific time and the characteristics of a particular frame of mind, which sought to adopt the evangelical conception to antagonisms peculiar to the times. Hence they cannot be, as no confession can be, considered in the very word and letter as fitted to impose an obligation for all times, and as having the right to exclude the Church from the benefit of the acquisition of theological study and Christian experience that come to it from generation to generation. Besides, observation has shown that those bodies which accept all the Lutheran Confessions and profess to hold and to teach them without qualification are exactly those which stand apart from each other in separate organizations and impeach the Lutheran character of each other and accuse each other of holding false doctrines, so that they will neither commune together, nor exchange pulpits with each other, nor even hold common prayer with each other, as is the case with the Missourians. For instance, the Joint Synod of Ohio, though holding all the Lutheran Confessions in the most rigid and unqualified sense, nevertheless refused to remain with the Synodical Conference because of dissatisfaction with the *interpretation* put upon Article XI. of the Formula of Concord by the said Conference, and refused to remain in the General Council, which it helped to organize at Reading, in 1866, because of "the four points," which if not arising directly out of the Confessions subsequent to the Augsburg Confession, are certainly connected with the spirit, which they, particularly the latest one, beget and foster.

Hence it must be said that the confessional relations of the Lutheran bodies in America are by no means harmonious, and the greatest discord exists between those bodies of Lutherans which are most strictly confessional. Or if it should seem harsh to state the facts about the Confessions in this *positive* form, it is at least absolutely certain that the unqualified adoption of all the Lutheran Confessions has not contributed to the production of an irenic spirit among Lutherans in America, nor to the production and maintenance of organic union. For the full

proof of these facts we have only to recall the separations and secessions that have occurred from time to time, and to cast a look at the controversial Lutheran literature that has accumulated on the shelves of some of our libraries. It stands true without the possibility of successful contradiction that the Book of Concord has not been an instrument of concord in the Lutheran Church in America. At the outbreak of the late Civil War some thirty Lutheran synods, extending from New York to Texas, and from the Atlantic to the Missouri River, were harmoniously united under the Augsburg Confession without the naming of the other Confessions. Every synod east of the Ohio River, with one or too insignificant exceptions, and the most of those west of it, were in this connection. The few remaining synods that subscribed the entire Book of Concord and accepted its articles of faith as unconditionally obligatory were then, as they have been continually ever since, in controversy and antagonism with each other. In the main, the standpoint sought to be occupied by such synods is identical with that which is supposed to have been occupied by the authors and framers of the Confessions. In other words they fight the battles of the sixteenth century over again.*

* It is quite different in Germany. Says Professor Albert Hauck, of Leipzig: "If the opponents of union in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries carried the day, that was the consequence of the conditions: The sharp formulation of doctrine against those of opposing views was done amid violent controversies. The greatest importance would be ascribed to the production of such work. The recent past has belonged to the friends of union, and also the immediate future will certainly belong to them. I do not mean that in the sense that the union is expected to extend to those German national churches which have not accepted it. For this there is no occasion. The effort would awaken the most violent opposition, and would lead to new separations. But it seems to me to be incontestable that the friends of union, rather than its enemies, have the general consent on their side. That is evident even in the ranks of the confessionalists. No confessional Lutheran national church can shut itself off bluntly against the Reformed: Almost everywhere the so-called guest-wise admission of the Reformed to the Holy Communion is practiced. And where this is not the case, it is not because the congregations take offense at it, but because it is contrary to the conviction of the pastor. This also is determined by general conditions. Modern intercourse has brought the adherents of the different confessions into much more frequent touch than was formerly the case. It cannot be otherwise than that people will be conscious that in many points they are one. There is also the additional fact that the antithesis in which Christianity is placed to-day lies far away from the points on which the Protestantism of the sixteenth century was divided: The natural consequence is that its significance will be estimated differently from what it was formerly. Finally, the work of theology—including confessional theology—has led to the result that nobody regards as absolutely pertinent the formulation which dogma found in the sixteenth century. Even the most pronounced Lutheran concedes that the Lutheran Confessions do not express his views in the same sense in which they expressed the views of their

5. *The Predestination Controversy.*

Nearly forty years ago the Reverend C. F. W. Walther, Professor of Theology in the Concordia Theological Seminary, at St. Louis, Missouri, a man as orthodox as John Gerhard and as pious as Philip Jacob Spener, startled the Lutheran theological world by an extreme, if not altogether *new,* interpretation of the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord, *Of God's Foreknowledge and Election.* For the purpose of exalting the glory and the majesty of the grace of God in the salvation of man as over against modern Pelagian and Synergistic views, he declared that Predestination or Election is the *cause* of salvation. Under controversy, Dr. Walther, whose views have become the views of the Missourians, stated the case thus: "It consists simply in the following twofold question: (1). *Whether God from eternity, before the foundations of the world were laid, out of pure mercy and only for the sake of the most holy merit of Christ, elected and ordained the chosen children of God to salvation and whatever pertains to it, consequently also to faith, repentance and conversion; or* (2) *whether in his election, God took into consideration anything good in man, namely, the foreseen conduct of man, the foreseen non-resistance, and the foreseen persevering faith, and thus elected certain persons to salvation in consideration, with respect to, on account of, or in consequence of their conduct, their non-resistance, and their faith.* The *first* of these questions we affirm, while our *opponents deny* it; but the *second* question *we deny,* while our *opponents affirm* it." *

1. In the long controversy Dr. Walther defended his position *exclusively* from the Formula of Concord, and charged that his opponents defended their position from the private writings of the Lutheran theologians subsequent to the promulgation of the Formula of Concord.

authors and their contemporaries. The customary distinction between the substance and the form of the Confession is nothing else than concession of this fact. But the consequence is that the divisive formula is judged differently from what it was formerly. In a word: Just as that which is common to the two confessions has gained in importance for the general consciousness, has that which is divisive lost in importance. Does it follow from this change that the Lutheran and Reformed peculiarities, which exist even apart from that which the two churches teach in regard to the Holy Supper, etc., are to disappear or have already disappeared? That the latter is not the case, even where the union obtains, is evident to every observer. And who would really desire the complete disappearance of the two types. Such a desire would be nothing else than that uniformity which was censured by Schleiermacher. But the realization of such a desire, as things now are, is impossible." *Realencyclopädie,* Article *Union, kirchliche.*

* *Controversy on Predestination,* p. 5.

2. He maintained that in the Formula of Concord, the doctrine of Predestination is applied in "a *stricter* sense," and "is understood to be that which extends only to the children of God who have been chosen and ordained to eternal life before the foundation of the world," while his opponents, he declares, understand Predestination in "a *wider* sense" as "that doctrine which comprises the general doctrine of the way of salvation for all men as a part, even as the first or chief part or one which is nothing else than that general doctrine of the way of salvation for all men."

3. Dr. Walther insisted that election is the *cause* of salvation, and in support of his proposition he quoted the Formula of Concord emphatically thus: "THE ETERNAL ELECTION OF GOD NOT ONLY FORESEES AND FOREKNOWS THE SALVATION OF THE ELECT, BUT THROUGH HIS GRACIOUS WILL AND GOOD PLEASURE IN CHRIST JESUS, IS ALSO A CAUSE WHICH PROCURES, WORKS, AIDS, AND PROMOTES OUR SALVATION AND WHATEVER PERTAINS TO IT." The position of his opponents he declares "to be nothing more than the following: In the first place, the *foreknowledge* of God that certain persons will receive the Gospel in true faith unto the end; and secondly, the *decree* that he will actually save the persons that thus persevere in faith."

4. Dr. Walther also stated in his own words as the proper meaning of the Formula of Concord, that Predestination is "a CAUSE of the salvation of the Elect," and is also "a *cause of faith*," and that his opponents regard faith as "a cause of Predestination."

It will thus be seen that the two views are directly antagonistic the one to the other. What one party regards as a *cause*, the other party regards as an *effect*, and *vice versa*. Dr. Walther and the Missourians charge that their opponents are "*not* Lutheran," are "Pelagian;" and these charge that Dr. Walther and the Missourians are "Calvinistic;" and in support of their allegation quote from the official declarations of the Missourians passages like the following: "The difference between the Calvinistic and Lutheran doctrines of Predestination is this: The Lutherans do not wish to explain how it comes about that it all depends on the mercy of God that in the case of some opposition and death are removed, but that others remain lost. The Lutherans dismiss this question, but the Calvinists answer it," etc., that is, the Missourians affirm the *single* or Augustinian *absolute* Predestination, while the Calvinists affirm the *double absolute*

Predestination. Neither the Missourians nor the Calvinists recognize the *intuitu fidei* or *fide praevisa*.

The position of the chief opponents of Missouri on Free-will, Conversion and Predestination were presented by Professor G. Fritschel, of the German Iowa Synod, as follows:

1. "Over against all these predestinarian inclinations must be strongly emphasized the fact *of the personal self-determination of man for or against salvation.*"

2. "That of two men who hear the Gospel, opposition and death are removed in the case of one and not in the case of the other . . . *has its ground in* the free self-determination of the man, although this is possible only by grace."

3. "That of two men, to whom the Gospel is preached, the one comes to faith, the other does not, according to God's Word is due solely and alone to the decision of the man."

4. "Whether a man shall be saved or lost rests *in its final ground* on the FREE *self-determination* of man for or against grace."

5. "It is certain that since God appoints only a number of men to eternal life, the ground of this lies either in the absolute election of God, who now but once only presents man with faith, or in the decision of man foreseen by God."

6. "The doctrine of the Lutheran Dogmaticians, that God has elected those whose faith He foresaw, is not Pelagian, but is a sound doctrine in full accord with the Word of God." *

It needs no special intellectual acumen to discover that these two sets of theses are fundamentally and irreconcilably antagonistic to each other. It is not possible to harmonize Professor Fritschel's "personal self-determination of man" and his "final ground," "foreseen faith," with the "predestination is the CAUSE of salvation," "without foreseen faith," "election is particular," of Dr. Walther and the Missourians. And yet, each party to the dispute professes *unqualified* acceptance of the Book of Concord, and finds in it support for its own doctrine of Predestination. And this controversy is not all of the past. Occasionally there have been truces, and colloquies have been held for the purpose of reaching an understanding, but the only understanding reached thus far is that each party has decided to stand the more firmly by its position. In a series of "free conferences," 1903-1907, between the Missourians on the one side, and the

* *Theologische Monatshefte*, 5 passim.

Iowans and the Ohioans on the other side, the subjects of Conversion and Predestination were earnestly debated. The chief question at issue was: "Why are *some* men, *rather than others*, converted and saved, since the grace of God in Christ is general, and since all men are alike in the same condition of depravity?" Or, "Cur alii prae aliis?" The Missourians found the answer to this question solely and alone in God and in his grace and in this: "It originates primarily from the eternal ordination of God who shall be saved." The other party held that the cause is the free self-determination of man, though this is first rendered possible only by grace. And so they separated, agreeing to disagree. But all these bodies agree essentially in reproducing and teaching in their schools the dogmatic theology of the seventeenth century. This is seen especially in the republication by Dr. Walther of Baier's *Compendium Theologiae Positivae* (1685) greatly augmented by quotations from the other dogmaticians, but without any recognition of modern Lutheran theology, except in antithesis.

6. *Scandinavian Lutheran Synods.*

Under this heading we register Lutherans that have emigrated from Scandinavian countries and settled in America or those that have been born here of Swedish, or Danish, or Norwegian extraction, and affiliate with churches known as Scandinavian Lutheran even though in many of these churches the English language is partly or exclusively used. The adjective "Scandinavian" can here then under circumstances have the same import as "Dutch" in "Reformed Dutch" or "Dutch Reformed." The Scandinavian Lutherans have, in matters confessional, generally followed the traditions of northern Europe.

The Swedish Augustana Synod belongs to the General Council and consequently subscribes to the entire Book of Concord, which was not a symbolical book of the Swedish Church when the early Swedes settled on the Delaware.

The United Norwegian Lutheran Church, numbering more than one hundred and fifty thousand communicants, accepts only the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism. There are a few ministers in this body who have advocated subscription to the Book of Concord. But the advocation has met nothing but discouragement, and was started by men who had received some theological schooling in institutions belonging to the Joint Synod of Ohio (German), or to "Missouri," or to the

General Council. The Hauges Synod and the Free Church, each with about forty thousand communicants, accept only two post-Reformation symbols, the Augsburg Confession and the Small Catechism. A portion of the Norwegians belong to what is known as "The Norwegian Synod," at one time affiliated with the Synodical Conference, or Missouri, to which their clergy still have strong leanings. But this Synod also is as yet content in subscribing only to the Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession. The early dependence of this Synod on Missouri received a classic expression in its dealing with the late Bishop F. W. Bugge, in 1861. It called Bugge, who had just graduated from the University of Christiania, in Norway, to a professorship of theology in our country. It conditioned the call, however, by the demand that he should further qualify himself by studying two years at an orthodox school of theology in our country, before entering upon his duties as theological professor. Bugge, who a few years later (1869) was appointed professor of theology in the University of Christiania and has done more than any other Norwegian University professor for promoting a scientific exegetical study of the New Testament—did not accept. Thus, almost fifty years ago did Missouri teach the immigrants to question the orthodoxy of one of the most orthodox universities in Europe. Two other synods may be mentioned, the Eielsen and the Icelandic. These, too, subscribe only to the Augsburg Confession and the Catechism.

The Danish Lutherans have two synods, "The Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America" and "The Danish United Lutheran Church," each with about ten or eleven thousand communicants. Both adhere to the symbols of the Church of Denmark, thus agreeing with the Norwegian Synods.

These Scandinavian Lutherans all preserve a good reputation for orthodoxy and piety. They have excellent colleges and theological seminaries, and have had the wisdom not to scout European university training, many of their ministers and professors being graduates of foreign universities. They are thus made secure against the bane of monolingualism. Of controversies they have had a full share, but they have not forgotten the importance of edification or the value of the layman in building the spiritual temple of the living God. The discussion of the technicalities of the Book of Concord as well as of the problems of Confessional subscription has been subordinate to questions of another order.

7. *The United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South.*

This body, having about fifty thousand members, was organized at Roanoke, Virginia, in the year 1886. It accepts as its doctrinal basis the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, the three ecumenical creeds, the unaltered Augsburg Confession and the other Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, "as they are set forth, defined and published in the Christian Book of Concord, or the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, published in 1580, as true and scriptural developments of the doctrines taught in the Augsburg Confession, and in the perfect harmony of one and the same pure, scriptural faith." This synod is much less confessionalistic than others that accept the same Book of Concord. It has been very pacific, and tries to act as a peacemaker between other Lutheran Synods that have not yet come to see eye to eye.

INDEX*

A

Absolution.
  in Augsburg confession, 113, 120.
  in Apology, 267.
Achtliederbuch, first German hymn-book, 8.
Adiaphora, 322, 325, 392-394.
  as viewed by J. Andreae, 408.
Agricola, Johann, 313.
Alber, Erasmus, 325.
Albert, count of Mansfeld, 122.
Altenburg colloquy, 365, 371.
Amsdorf, Nicholas von, 240, 313, 325.
  on good works, 395.
  "Public confession of the pure doctrine of the gospel," 354.
Amsterdam church order, 601.
Anabaptists, 51, 109, 111, 116, 134.
Andreae, Jacob, 361, 432-436.
  and Lutheran pacification, 401 ff.
  and revision of Torgau book, 470 ff.
  censured by Prussian theologians, 463.
  character as judged by Selneccer, 433.
  "Christian sermons," 405.
  Christology of, 434-436.
  epitome of Torgau book, 469.
  in Torgau convention, 422 ff.
  letter to Heshuss and Wigand on Torgau convention, 429.
  on free-will, 435.
  on the method of subscription to Concord formula, 494.
Anhalt theologians.
  on the teachings of Melanchton, 456.
  on Torgau book, 456-457.
Ansbach theologians on Torgau book, 457.
Anthropological controversy, 333-371.
Antichrist, 275, 614.
Anti-confessionalists, 578-583.
Antinomian controversy, 312.
Anton, J. N., 311.
Apologia, oder Verantwortung des Concordien Buchs, 509-511.
Apology of Augsburg confession, 260-268.
  analysis of, 266-268.
  first form of, 261-262.
  Melanchthon's greatest achievement next to the confession, 266.
  offered to Emperor, 262.
  Editions:
    Editio princeps, 214, 264.
    Rev. Latin edition of 1531, 265.
Archbishop of Saltzburg on reconciliation, 141.
Arians on Christ, 105.
Arndt, Johann, 536.
Arnold, Gottfried.
  on the subscription to the Concord formula, 495 note.
Augsburg, Bishop of, on reconciliation, 141.
Augsburg confession, 46 ff.
  agreement between Protestants, 81.
  anaylsis of, 104-122.
  articles of faith, reason for including, 54.
  authorship of, 68-73.
  characteristics of, 92-103.
  conciliatory spirit of, 191.
  criticism by John Eck, 146.
  effect of reading of, at Augsburg diet, 89.
  finished and signed, 82.
  first draft sent to Luther, 57-58.
  first official declaration on, 149-151.
  growing importance as a symbol, 289 ff.
  in America. *See* Lutheran symbols in America.
  Luther's relation to, 194-208.
  materials used, 61-73.
  Melanchthon chosen as framer of, 49.
  Melanchthon's apology of, 192.
  Melanchthon's Editio princeps compared with the "Invariata," 215-217.
  not a system of theology, 99.
  not in existence as delivered to Emperor, 211.
  not regarded as a symbolical writing in the beginning, 276 ff.
  oldest redaction of, 50, 55-58.
  original manuscripts, fate of, 209.
  preface of, 50-53.
  read and delivered, 83-89.
  shortcomings of, 98.
  signatures of, 122.
  signed at Naumburg diet of 1561, 299.
  translated and forwarded to foreign potentates, 87.
  Editions by Melanchthon, 209-233.

*The Index was prepared by Mr. Juul Dieserud, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Editio princeps of 1531 (Latin and German), 212-217.
(German version endorsed by Naumburg diet, 296.)
Editio octavae formae of 1531, 217-218.
(endorsed by Naumburg diet, 296-298.)
Confessio Augustana variata of 1540, 224-226.
(endorsed by Naumburg diet, 302-304.)
Latin variata of 1541-42, 230.
German variata of 1533, 219-220.
German editions of 1540, 221.
Octavo edition (German) of 1550, 222.
Quarto edition (German) of 1555, 222.
Octavo edition (German) of 1556, 223.
Quarto edition (German) of 1558, 223.
Edition by Prof. Tschackert (the "Invariata"), 105, 210.
Textus receptus, 210, 224, 523.
Augsburg confession. *See also* Confessio Saxonica.
Apology of. *See* Apology of Augsburg confession.
Augsburg, Diet of 1530, 24 ff.
opening of, 76-77.
reconciliation efforts, 138-193.
remonstrances against Lutheran concessions, 174-182.
Imperial decree of. *See* Imperial decree of Augsb. diet.
Augsburg, diet of 1547, 320.
Augsburg interim, 320-323.
Augsburg religious peace of 1555, 249-254, 289.
August, elector of Saxony.
and Naumburg diet, 292.
and pacification efforts, 414 ff.
and subscription to the Book of Concord, 528.
and subscription to Concord formula, 491 ff.
communication to H. von Bernstein, etc., on a common corpus doctrinae, 418.
letter to Elector of Brandenburg on Torgau book, 473.
Aurifaber, John, 311.

B

Baden theologians on Torgau book, 453.
Bahrdt, C. F., on Rationalism, 569.
Baptism.
as viewed by Luther, 386.
in Augsburg confession, 56, 111.
in Catholic confutation, 134.
Baumgarten, S. J.
"Evangelische Glaubenslehre," 564.
Baumgartner, Hieronymus, on reconciliation efforts at Augsburg, 180-181.
Bengel, J. A., on the symbolical books, 556.
Bergen conferences on Torgau book, 470 ff.
report of second meeting, 474-477.
Bergic book. *See* Concord formula.
Besserer, Bernhard, 190 note.
Bezold, Friedrich von, on Augsburg confession, 94.
Bible, editions of, 2.
Bidembach, Balthasar, and Maulbronn formula, 416.
Binder, Christopher, and Strigel's Declaration on free-will, 361.
Bindseil, H. E., on Confessio Augustana variata of 1540, 224-226.
Bishop of Augsburg on reconciliation, 141.
Bishops' power. *See* Ecclesiastical power.
Bologna, League of, 25 note.
Book of Concord, 255, 519 ff.
adoption of Textus receptus of Augsb. confession, 224, 523.
and the Synodical conference, 613.
contents of, 521-525.
in America, 617.
subscription to the, 527-530.
Editions:
Editio princeps of 1580, 519.
Latin edition of 1580, 525.
German-Latin edition of 1582, 526.
Latin edition of 1602, 527.
Both species of the Sacrament. *See* Lord's Supper.
Brandenburg-Nürnberg order, 286.
Brandenburg order, 309.
Brandenburg theologians on Torgau book, 460.
Braun, Gottfried, on confessional subscription, 593-596.
Bremen, Acceptance of Calvinistic doctrine, 329.
Brenz, John.
"Apology," 362.
on adiaphora, 393.
on authorship of Augsb. confession, 72.
on the two natures of Christ, 382.
Bretschneider, K. G., and the symbolical books, 569, 579, 582.
Brück, Gregorius, 170, 173.
answer to Catholic princes, 142.
on Protestant preaching, 75.
Brunswick church order of 1569, 401.
Brunswick theologians.

and the Book of Concord, 530.
on Torgau book, 458.
Buddeus, J. F.
"Institutio theologiae dogmaticae," 555.
Bugenhagen, Johann.
on resistance of the Emperor, 240.
ordination certificate issued by him and Forster, 285.
Bugge, F. W., 622.

C

Calinich, Hermann.
Comparison of Augustana and the Schwabach articles, 65-66.
on Naumburg diet, 295.
on transubstantiation in Augsb. confession, 112.
Calixtus, Georg, and syncretism, 543.
Calovius, Abraham.
and syncretism, 543.
"Systema locorum theologicorum," 541.
Calvinism, 329-330.
and predestination controversy, 619-620.
in Concord formula, 487.
See also Crypto-Calvinism.
Calvinistic view of the sacrament not endorsed by Naumburg diet, 302.
Calvinists and Augsburg confession, 291.
Camerarius, Joachim.
on authorship of Augsb. confession, 72.
Campeggius, Cardinal, 83, 124-125.
Carpovius, Jacob.
"Theologia revelata dogmatica," 564.
Catechisms, Luther's.
not given early rank as symbols, 288.
See also Luther, Martin, Works, Two catechisms.
Catholic committee.
reply to Chancellor Brück, 142-143.
Catholic confutation, 123-137.
character of, 132.
fifth form accepted by Emperor, 129.
first form delivered to Emperor, 128, 130, 131.
prepared by Eck, 128.
summary of, 133-137.
title of 1st edition, 132.
Charles V.
and Augsburg diet, 76 ff.
Augsburg confession read before Emperor, 86-87.
character of, 123.
diplomatic efforts to effect reconciliation at Augsburg diet, 168.
opinion on articles of faith of Augsburg confession, 90.
refusal to hear confession read before large assembly, 84.
Chemnitz, Martin, 436-441.
and revision of Torgau book, 470 ff.
and the Swabian concordia, 412.
letter to Heshuss on Torgau book, 425-429.
on changes in Torgau book, 479.
on free-will, 438.
Works:
An examination of the Council of Trent, 437.
De duabus naturis in Christo, 383, 437.
Chiliasm, 611, 613, 614.
Chiliasts on the reign of Christ, 116.
Christ, two natures of, 106, 133.
as viewed by Andreae, 409-410.
as viewed by Chytraeus, 448.
as viewed by Selneccer, 445.
See also Christological controversy, 372 ff.
Christ, ubiquity of, 305, 382.
as viewed by Baumgarten, 565.
as viewed by Musculus, 451.
at Quedlinburg colloquy, 530.
in Concord formula, 483, 516.
See also Lord's Supper.
Christlieb and Schian on the Lutheran preachers of 17th century, 534.
Christological controversy, 372-385.
Christology.
of Anhalt theologians, 457.
of Calixtus, 544.
of Maulbronn formula, 416.
of Schleiermacher, 573.
Saxon, 385.
Swabian, 385.
Christopher, duke of Würtemberg at second Augsburg diet, 250.
Church, 109-110, 134, 614.
Church, Ministry of. *See* Ministry of the Church.
Church orders.
and Augsb. confession, 287.
and the confessions, 307.
Chytraeus, David, 445-450.
on changes in Torgau book, 479.
on free-will, 344.
Works:
Catechesis, 446.
History of the Augsburg confession, 446.
Orationes et epistolae, 446.
Civil affairs, 115, 135.
Coburg, Luther's sojourn at, during Augsb. diet, 37-39.
Cochlaeus on justification by faith, 149 note.

Coelestin, Georg.
on meeting of Evangelical princes and estates June 21, at Augsb. diet, 80.
on signing of Augsb. confession, 82.
Collegium philobiblicum in Leipzig, 554.
Colloquies, Religious, 245-249.
Cologne order, 287.
Committee of six, 170-174.
Answer of Protestants to Catholic proposal, 172.
Committee of fourteen, 145-169.
censured by Nürnberg Senate, 174-177.
censured by Spengler, 178.
censured by Seiler, 177.
comment by Rotermund on its transactions, 165.
declaration by Lutheran members, 149-150.
Committee of sixteen.
on reconciliation, 140-145.
Concord, Book of. *See* Book of Concord.
Concord formula, 469-518.
and Lutherans in America, 507, 613, 614, 616, 618, 623.
and Textus receptus of Augsb. confession, 211 note.
Apology of, by Kirchner, Selneccer and Chemnitz, 509-511.
as viewed by Kawerau, 484.
as viewed by Kurtz, 485.
as viewed by Mosheim, 512.
as viewed by Müller, 485.
as viewed by Planck, 514.
comparison with Torgau book, 480-485.
effect of subscription to, 505-518.
has done more harm than good, 518.
Lutherish rather than Lutheran, 484.
publications attacking it, 508-509.
subscription to the, 491-518.
See also Book of Concord.
Confederations-notel of Rotach convention, 19.
Confessio Saxonica, 248.
Confessio Tetrapolitana, 236, 243.
Confession, 154, 160, 175-176.
in Augsburg confession, 113, 120.
in Catholic confutation, 134, 136.
Confession and opinion on free-will by Wittenberg theologians, 368.
Confessional subscription, 586, 587, 590, 593-596.
See also Lutheran symbols.
Confessionalists, 578-583.
Confessions, Lutheran.
See Lutheran confessions.
Confutation book of Flacianists, 300.
Confutation book of John Frederick the second, 328.
Consensus repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae, 544-545.
Consistorial order of Wittenberg, 286.
Conversion, 618-621.
as viewed by Strigel, 367.
See also Free-will, Justification by faith, Predestination.
Corpora doctrinae, 314-320.
Corpus Brandenburgicum, 318.
Corpus doctrinae christianae, ed. by Melanchthon, 218, 314-316, 402, 404, 421.
defended by the Synod of Pomerania, 455.
Corpus doctrinae, Hohenlohe. *See* Hohenlohe corpus doctrinae.
Corpus doctrinae Thuringicum, 218, 317.
Corpus Julium, 218, 319.
Corpus misnicum. *See* Corpus doctrinae christianae.
Corpus of the city of Brunswick, 316.
Corpus Philippicum. *See* Corpus doctrinae christianae.
Corpus Pomeranicum, 221, 316.
Corpus Prutenicum, 317.
Corpus Thuringicum. *See* Corpus doctrinae Thuringicum.
Corpus Wilhelminum, 318.
Coswig articles, 346.
Crypto-Calvinism, 305, 329.
driven from Wittenberg, 418.
Cujus regio ejus religio, principle of, 252.
Curaeus, Joachim.
"Exegesis perspicua," 330.

D

Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 622.
Danish United Lutheran Church, 622.
Demonstratio manifesti mendacii, by Pfeffinger, 354.
Denmark and the Lutheran symbols, 597, 599.
Descartes, René, 558.
Determinism. *See* Free-will, Predestination.
Documents against Luther handed to Emperor with Catholic confutation, 129.
Donatists, 110.
Dorner on the two natures of Christ, 385.
Dresden consensus of 1571, 330.

E

Ecclesiastical orders, 114, 134.
Ecclesiastical power, 161, 273.

in Augsburg confession, 121.
in Catholic confutation, 137.
Nürnberg Senate on, 176.
Ecclesiastical reservation, 253.
Ecclesiastical rites, 115, 134.
Ecclesiastical union, 575-578.
Eck, Johann, 170.
authorship of Catholic confutation, 128.
"Four hundred and four articles," 41-42.
opinion on the articles of Augsb. confession, 146.
Eielsen synod, 622.
Eisenach synod.
on Good works, 396.
Eitzen, Paul von, and the Concord formula, 501.
Elector of Saxony. *See* John, elector of Saxony.
Erasmus on free-will, 346 note.
Erfurt book, 509-511.
Ernest, duke of Brunswick, 122.
Ernesti, J. A., 563.
Essay An, in Förstemann's Urkundenbuch, 28-35.
Eucharist. *See* Lord's Supper.
Eunomians on Christ, 106.
Evjen, J. O., on the Book of Concord as a symbol, 592 note.
Exchange of pulpit with sectarians, 611.
Exegesis, 532.
Exegesis perspicua, by J. Curaeus, 330.
Exegetical studies introduced at Saxon universities, 552.

F

Fabri, Johann, on contradictions in Luther's writings, 127.
Fasts, Nürnberg Senate on, 176.
Fasts. *See also* Meats.
Fikencher on Melanchthon's progress with Augsb. confession, 58 note.
Fischer's ordination certificate, issued by Luther, 284.
Flacianism, 324, 327.
and free-will, 345 ff.
and predestination, 357.
expelled from Jena, 418.
Flacianists.
at Naumburg diet of 1561, 300-301.
their Confutation book of 1559, 300.
Flacius, Matthias, 320, 323.
controversy with G. Major on good works, 395.
discrediting Latin variata of 1540, 230.
doctrine of free-will, 345.
on adiaphora, 325, 393.
on free-will, in Weimar disputation, 359 ff.
refutation of Pfeffinger's propositions on free-will, 355.
Formula of Concord. *See* Concord formula.
Formula of pacification of Duke of Mecklenburg, 347.
Formulae of subscription. *See* Subscription formulae.
Förstemann, K. E., on Torgau articles, 30-31.
Francis, duke of Brunswick, 122.
Frank, F. H. R.
on the Lutheran symbols, 589.
on the Osiandrian theory, 378.
Frankfort diet of 1558, 400.
Frankfort recess, 328.
Frederick, elector of the Palatinate, and the Diet of Naumburg, 293 ff.
Frederick William, king of Prussia, and ecclesiastical union, 576.
Free Church, Norwegian, 622.
Free-will, 312, 351-371.
and Flacianism, 345 ff.
and Predestination controversy, 620.
as taught by Andreae, 407, 435.
as taught by Chemnitz, 438.
as taught by Chytraeus, 344, 446-448.
as taught by Luther, 333-338.
as taught by Melanchthon, 338-345, 349 ff.
as taught by Prussian theologians, 463.
as taught by Selneccer, 442-445.
as taught by Strigel, 360 ff.
in Augsburg confession, 116.
in Catholic confutation, 135.
in Concord formula, 480-483, 487, 502, 504.
in Formula of pacification of Duke of Mecklenburg, 347-348.
in Swabian-Saxon concordia, 481.
in Torgau book, 423.
Freytag, Gustav, on the Lutheran ministers, 546.
Fritschel, G., and Predestination controversy, 620.

G

Gallus, Nicholas, 325.
General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in N. A., 608-612.
General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the U. S., 606-608.
George, margrave of Brandenburg, 122.

George Ernest, count of Henneberg, and pacification efforts, 414 ff.
George Frederick, margrave of Prussia, and the Concord formula, 497.
Gerhard, Johann.
"Loci communes theologici," 540.
Gerhard, Robert.
"Symboliker und Anti-symboliker," 579.
German Iowa synod, 613-614.
German Puseyism. *See* New Lutheranism.
Gieseler, Johann, on Augsburg confession as a symbol, 290.
Glassius, Solomon, on Syncretistic controversy, 544.
God. *See* Christ, Trinity.
Good works:
as viewed by Andreae, 406.
as viewed by Major, 394.
in Augsburg confession, 117.
in Catholic confutation, 133, 135.
See also Conversion, Free-will, New obedience.
Goslar order, 286.

H

Hagen, Bernhard, in committee of six, 170.
Hagenau colloquy of 1540, 246.
Halle, University of, 554.
Hamburg theologians on Torgau book, 461.
Harless, Adolph, and the symbolical books, 581.
Harms, Claus.
and Rationalism, 573-575.
his 95 theses, 574.
Hauck, Albert, on Church union, 617 note.
Hauge's synod, 622.
Hebrew psalter, 2.
Heidelberg catechism, 511.
Heller, Sebastian, 170.
Helmstädt theologians on the Book of Concord, 529.
Hengstenberg and the Symbolical books, 579.
Henry VIII. and Schmalkald league, 245-246.
Herdessianus, Christopher, and the Concord formula, 508.
Hergenröther, Cardinal, on Schmalkald convention, 242.
Hermann, elector of Cologne.
impressed by reading of Augsburg confession, 91.
Hesse theologians on Torgau book, 453.
Heshuss, Tilemann.
letter and opinion on Torgau book, 430, 462.
on Andreae's pacification efforts, 403.
on free-will, 364.
Hillsbach meeting, 291.
Hoffmann, Daniel, on the Book of Concord, 531.
Hofmann, J. C. K. von.
"Schriftbeweis," 585.
Hohenlohe corpus doctrinae, 308, 319.
Hollazius, David, and Pietism, 554.
Holstein theologians on Torgau book, 452.
Holy alliance, 576.
Hügel, Andreas, and the Confutation book, 358.
Hutter, Leonhard, 539.
"Loci communes theologici," 540.
Hymn-book, first German. *See* Achtliederbuch.

I

Icelandic synod, 622.
Imperial decree of Augsburg diet, 235-239.
Luther on, 240.
Summary of, by Sleidanus, 237.
Wittenberg jurists on, 239.
Imperial rescript summoning Augsburg diet, 24.
Ingolstadt theological faculty, 41.
Interims, 320-329.

J

Jacobs, H. E.
on Melanchthon's Lutheran soundness in regard to the Lord's Supper, 228 note.
"A summary of the Christian faith," 612.
Jena consistorial order of 1569, 307.
Jena theologians.
and the Book of Concord, 528.
on Andreae's pacification efforts, 403.
Jena University established, 327.
Jesus Christ. *See* Christ.
Joachim, elector of Brandenburg.
and Imperial interim, 250, 254.
attack on Elector of Saxony, 142.
Johannsen on the symbolists and anti-symbolists, 582.
John, duke of Holstein, on Torgau book, 453.
John, elector of Saxony.
"Articles concerning faith." *See* Schwabach articles.
"Confession of faith," 40, 43-45, 63.
exhorts Protestant princes at Augsburg diet, 79.

letter to Luther on reading of Augsburg confession, 88.
"Opinion" on invitation to Council at Mantua, 269.
refusal to follow Emperor's summons to meet at Cologne, 240.
John Frederick, duke of Saxony.
and Naumburg diet, 292 ff.
and Weimar confutation-book, 358.
John Frederick, elector of Saxony, 326.
John George, elector of Brandenburg.
and subscription to the Concord formula, 492.
John William, duke of Saxony.
on free-will controversy, 365.
Joint synod of Ohio, 616.
Jonas, Justus, 240.
Judgment.
in Augsburg confession, 115.
in Catholic confutation, 135.
Justification by faith, 152, 396.
and John Eck, 149.
as viewed by Andreae, 405.
as viewed by Luther, 342.
central principle of Augsburg confession, 97, 99-101, 281.
in Augsburg confession, 107.
in Catholic confutation, 133.
in German Editio princeps of Augsb. confession, 217.
in German Variatae of 1532, 220.
permeated the Augsburg confession and the Apology, 281.

K

Kahnis, C. F.
"Die Lutherische Dogmatik," 585.
on the Lutheran preachers of the 17th century, 534.
on the Symbolical books, 586-587.
Kawerau, Gustav.
on Augsburg confession, 95.
on Concord formula, 484, 506.
Kenotism, 507.
Keys, power of, 51.
See also Confession, Ecclesiastical power.
Knaake, Joachim.
comparison of Augustana and the Schwabach articles, 66-67.
Koehler, on the Symbolical books, 590.
Koerner, Christopher, 451.
Kolde, Theodor.
on Augsburg confession, 96.
on Concord formula, 489.
on Editio princeps of Augsburg confession, 214.
on Editio princeps of Book of Concord, 519-520.
on Luther's relation to reconciliation efforts at Augsburg, 195.
Köllner, on Lutheran symbols, 309.
on subscription to the symbols, 582.
Köstlin, Julius, on Luther's view of the confessions, 280.
Krypticism, 383.
Kurtz, J. H.
on Lutherism, 313.
on the Concord formula, 485.

L

Law. *See* Ten Commandments.
Leibnitz, G. W., 560.
Leipzig interim of 1548, 322, 392.
Leipzig theologians.
and the Book of Concord, 527.
Liber Augustanus, 321.
Liberum arbitrium. *See* Free-will.
Lichtenberg convention, 419.
Lippe order, 309.
Locke, John, 559.
Loescher, V. E., and Pietism, 554.
Lord's Supper, 149, 157-159, 163, 387-392.
and Crypto-Calvinism, 329.
as endorsed by Naumburg diet, 302.
as taught by Andreae, 435.
as taught by Calixtus, 543.
as taught by Chemnitz, 439.
as taught by Chytraeus, 449.
as taught by Luther, 183, 186.
as taught by Melanchthon, 389.
at second Bergen meeting, 474.
discussion of both species at Naumburg diet, 294.
in Apology, 267.
in Augsburg confession, 111-112, 119.
in Catholic confutation, 134-135.
in Concord formula, 480.
in Confessio Augustana variata of 1540, 226-227.
in Elector's confession of 1530, 43.
in oldest redaction of Augsburg confession, 56.
in Torgau confession, 331.
Melanchthon's view on, not Zwinglian, 305.
See also Christ, ubiquity of.
Ludwig, duke of Würtemberg,
and the subscription to the Concord formula, 496.
Lübeck theologians on Torgau book, 461.
Lüneburg order, 307.
Lüneburg theologians on Torgau book, 461.
Luthardt, Chr., on Concord formula, 488.
Luther, Martin, 3-9.
Christology of, 372-374.
conception of the Lord's Supper, 387-392.

inspected only first draft of Augsburg confession, 57-58.
letter to Archbishop of Mayence on Augsb. confession, 204-205.
letter to Cordatus on Augsb. confession, 203.
letter to Elector of July 9 on Augsb. confession, 205.
letter to Elector of August 26, 182-185.
letter to Elector on Zwinglianism, 18.
letter to Jonas on efforts of conciliation at Augsburg diet, 187.
letter to Jonas on lack of information from Augsburg diet, 195.
letter to Jonas on preparation for Augsburg diet, 27.
letter to Jonas on Protestant concessions at Augsburg diet, 202.
letter to Melanchthon on efforts of reconciliation at Augsburg diet, 185-187.
letter to Melanchthon on receipt of Augsburg confession, 200.
letter to Spalatin of August 26, 1530, 185.
letter to Spengler of August 28, 1530, 189.
not the chief author of Augsburg confession, 196-207.
oath at his promotion to the doctorate, 5 note.
on baptism, 386.
on the Loci communes of Melanchthon, 467 note.
"Opinion" of Luther and others on Imperial decree of Augsburg diet, 240.
"Opinion" on Protestant concessions at Augsburg diet, 188-189.
ordination formula of Luther, 284.
qualities of his leadership, 3.
reason for leaving him at Coburg, 37-38.
relation to Augsburg confession, 194-207.
Spengler on failure to secure Luther's advice at Augsburg diet, 179.
Works:
Articuli, so da hälten sollen aufs Concilium zu Mantua, 1538, 273.
Catechisms, editions of, 255-260.
(not given early rank as symbols, 288.)
Concerning Christian liberty, 7, 52.
De servo arbitrio, 333, 363, 365-366.
Formula Missae, 8.
German Mass and order of Divine service, 8, 256.
Greater confession of the Lord's Supper, 8, 388.
Order of worship in the congregation, 8.
Prelude on the Babylonish captivity of the church, 7, 52.
Short form of the Ten Commandments, 255-256.
Small confession of the Holy Sacrament, 388.
The three symbols, 276.
To the Christian nobility of the German nation, 6, 52.
Visitation articles, 276.
Lutheran church in America, 601-623.
Lutheran church in Denmark, 597.
Lutheran church in Norway, 597-598.
Lutheran church in Prussia, 576-578.
See also Prussian theologians.
Lutheran Church in Sweden, 598-600.
Lutheran confessions.
growing veneration for, 308.
in the 19th century, 571.
See also Confessionalists, Lutheran symbols.
Lutheran dogmatic, 532-545.
of the 17th century, criticised, 542
Lutheran dogmaticians, 539.
Lutheran orthodoxy. *See* Lutheran dogmatic.
Lutheran symbols, 421.
and Rationalism, 568.
authority of, 309-310.
authority of in the 17th century, 537.
as viewed by J. A. Bengel, 556.
as viewed by Spener, 553.
as viewed by Walch, 555.
editions of, 578.
in America, 601-623.
See also Confessionalists, Lutheran confessions.
Lutheran synod, 578.
Lutherans in America and the Concord formula, 507.
Lutheranism.
characteristics of, 615-616.
spread of, 23, 249.
Lutheranism, new. *See* New Lutheranism.
Lutherism, 306, 313-314, 399.
in the Concord formula, 465.

M

Magdeburg centuries, 325.
Magdeburg theologians on Torgau book, 458.
Mahometans on Christ, 106.
Major, Georg, 394-399.
on good works, 394.
Majoristic controversy, 394-399.

Manichæans, 105.
Mansfeld ministers on free-will controversy, 364.
Mantua, general council of 1537, 268.
Marburg articles, 9, 20, 61.
Marburg conference of 1529, 19-20.
Marburg University, 23.
Marriage of priests, 163-164.
  in Augsburg confession, 119.
  in Catholic confutation, 135.
Martensen, Hans.
  on Concord formula, 488.
  on the Symbolical books, 599.
Mass, 15, 160, 171, 178.
  in Augsburg confession, 119.
  in Catholic confutation, 136.
  in Luther's Articles for Council at Mantua, 274.
  opinion of Luther in letter to Elector, 183-184.
  opinion of Seiler, 178.
Mathesius, Johann, and the Book of Concord, 528.
Matthes, Carl, on symbolical character of Augsburg confession, 278.
Maulbronn formula, 414-417.
  at Torgau convention, 422.
Maurice, elector of Saxony, 326.
Meats, 160.
  See also Fasts.
Meats, distinction of, 120, 136.
Mecklenburg "Formula pacificationis," and free-will, 347-348.
Mecklenburg theologians on Torgau book, 459.
Melanchthon, Philip, 9-11.
  Augsburg confession, chosen as framer of, 49.
  Augsburg confession, his classic monument, 68-73.
  author of the statutes of Wittenberg theological faculty, 282.
  censured by Prussian theologians, 464-465.
  Christology of, 374-375.
  confutation of the Osiandrian doctrine, 380.
  defended by Anhalt theolgians, 456.
  defended by Magdeburg theologians, 458.
  deserves thanks for his "variatae" editions of Augsburg confession, 232.
  letter to Cardinal Campeggius of July 6, 1530, 139.
  letter to Luther of August 22, 1530, 167-168.
  Lutheran soundness in regard to the Lord's Supper, 227-229.
  mental attitude in 1530, 47-48.
  on Augsburg interim, 321.
  on free-will, 341, 349-358.
  on predestination and free-will, 338.
  opinion on invitation to general council at Mantua, 269.
  report on articles, not settled by committee of fourteen, 166-167.
  reports on progress of Apology, 263-264.
  Torgau articles penned by, 35.
  view on the Lord's Supper, 389.
  view on the Lord's Supper, not Zwinglian, 305.
  Works:
    Corpus doctrinae Christianae, 314-316, 389.
    Loci communes, 11, 312.
    The power and jurisdiction of the bishops, 273.
    Tractate on the power and primacy of the Pope, 273.
Melanchthonism, 306, 314, 399.
Michaelis, J. D., 563.
Ministerium of New York.
  See New York Ministerium.
Ministerium of Pennsylvania.
  and the Reformed church, 604.
  and the Symbolical books, 602, 605.
Ministry of the church, 108, 133, 614.
  See also Ecclesiastical orders.
Missourians. *See* Synodical conference.
Monastic vows. *See* Vows of monks.
Mosheim, J. L., on the Concord formula, 512.
Müller, Karl.
  on the Concord formula, 485.
  on subscription to the Concord formula, 492.
Musculus, Andreas, 450-451.

N

Naumburg convention of 1554, 248, 250.
Naumburg diet, 290-301, 307.
  Preface to Augsburg confession prepared by the two Electors, 298.
  subscribes German Editio princeps and Latin octavo edition of Augsburg confession, 296-298.
Necessitarianism. *See* Predestination.
Neuberg theologians on Torgau book, 454.
New Lutheranism, 583-590.
New obedience, 109.
New York Ministerium and the Symbolical books, 603.
Norway and the Lutheran symbols, 597-598.
Norwegian synod, 622.
Nürnberg commissioners.
  on meeting of Evangelical princes and estates, June 21, at Augsburg diet, 81.
  on opening of Augsburg diet, 77.

on preparation of Augsburg confession, 58-59.
on reading of Augsburg confession, 84, 88.
on signing of Augsburg confession, 83.
report on Melanchthon's progress with Augsburg confession, 58-60.
Nürnberg Normal book, 319.
Nürnberg Senate.
"Judicium et censura," 174-177.
Nürnberg theologians and the Concord formula, 503.

O

Ohio, Joint synod of, 616.
Opus operatum, 171.
See also Lord's Supper, Sacramental controversy.
Orders, Ecclesiastical. *See* Ecclesiastical orders.
Ordination certificate issued by Bugenhagen and Forster, 285.
Original sin.
as viewed by Andreae, 407.
in Apology of Augsb. confession, 266-267.
in Augsburg confession, 106.
in Catholic confutation, 133.
in German variata of 1532, 220.
in Melanchthon's Loci communes, 340-341.
in Torgau book, 423.
Osiander, Andreas, 313, 376-378.
Christology of, 377-378.
"Of the only mediator Jesus Christ and justification by faith," 376.
Osiander, Luke, and Maulbronn formula, 415.

P

Pacification efforts, 400-417.
Paul III. proclaims general council to assemble at Mantua, 268.
Pelagians on original sin, 106.
Penance. *See* Repentance.
Pennsylvania Ministerium. *See* Ministerium of Pennsylvania.
Peucer, Caspar, 331.
Pfaff, C. M., and Pietism, 556.
Pfeffinger, Johann.
"Demonstratio manifesti mendacii," 354.
"Questiones quinque de libertate voluntatis humanae," 251.
Philip, landgrave of Hesse and Marburg conference of 1529, 19.
and Zwinglianism, 78.
Philippi, F. A.
"Kirchliche Glaubenslehre," 584.
"Lectures on symbolics," 586.
on Luther's De servo arbitrio, 336.
Philippists.
and Lord's Supper, 478.
on free-will, 366-367.
stigmatized as Crypto-Calvinists, 329.
Philosophy, Modern, 558-565.
Pia desideria of Spener, 549.
Pietism, 547-558.
and New Lutheranism, 584.
Planck, Gottlieb.
"Geschichte der protestantischen theologie," 508.
on authorship of Augsburg confession, 72.
on Concord formula, 513.
on Melanchthon's teachings regarding free-will, 344.
Plitt, Gustav, on Luther's participation in framing of Augsburg confession, 197-198.
Pomeranian order.
and Lutheran confessions, 287.
Pomeranian synod of 1577.
on Torgau book, 455.
Pomeranian synod of 1578.
on free-will, 343.
Pomeranian theologians.
on the Concord formula, 501.
Pope, Power and primacy of, 273.
Luther on, 274.
Pope, the "true Antichrist," 275, 614.
Power of the Keys.
See Keys, Power of.
Predestination, 333 ff.
and Flacianism, 357.
as defended by Amsdorf, 356.
See also Free-will.
Predestination controversy, 618-621.
Presence of Christ in Holy Supper. *See* Lord's Supper.
Priests, marriage of. *See* Marriage of priests.
Protestant appeal at Diet of Speyer, 14-16.
Protestant preaching, 74-75.
Protestant princes.
reply to Catholic committee, 143-145.
Protestant theologians.
"Opinion" on the subject of concord, presented to Protestant princes, 147-148.
Prussian national church, 576-578.
Prussian theologians.
on Melanchthon's teachings, 464-465.
on Torgau book, 462-466.
Public confession of the pure doctrine of the gospel, by Amsdorf, 354.
Pulpits, exchange of, 611, 613.

Q

Quedlinburg colloquy, 530-532.

Quenstedt, J. A.
"Theologia didactico-polemica," 541.
Questiones quinque de libertate voluntatis humanae, by Pfeffinger, 251.

R

Ranke, Leopold von.
Augsburg confession, 93.
Augsburg confession not intended as a norm for all times, 232.
on Augsburg interim, 321.
on dogmatic import of Augsburg confession, 277.
on Schmalkald league, 242.
Rationalism, 565-570.
and Symbolical books, 568.
decline of, 571.
Recess, Imperial, of Augsburg diet. *See* Imperial decree of Augsburg diet.
Reconciliatory spirit of Saxon court, 26.
Reformed church.
in America, 605-607.
in Germany, 511.
in Prussia, 576-578.
See also Zwinglian influence in Germany, 16-20.
Regensburg colloquy of 1541, 247.
Rehtmeyer, Philip.
on changes in Torgau book, 480.
Repentance, 113, 134.
Richter, Aemilius L.
on the Symbolical books, 580-581.
Rites. *See* Ecclesiastical rites.
Rotach convention, 18-19.
Rotermund on transactions of committee of fourteen, 165.
Rudelbach, A. G.
"Introduction to the Augsburg confession," 578.
"Reformation, Lutherthum und Union," 578.
symbolical character of Augsburg confession, 279, 288.

S

Saalfeld meeting of 1829, 20.
Sacramental controversy, 386-392.
Sacramental presence. *See* Lord's Supper.
Sacraments, 114, 133.
and New Lutheranism, 584.
Saints.
Nürnberg Senate on, 176.
worship of, 117, 135.
Salig, Christian.
on free-will controversy, 362, 363.
on "Variata" of 1540, 303.
Saltzburg, archbishop of.
on reconciliation, 141.
Samosatanians on Christ, 106.
Sartorius, Ernst.
and the Symbolical books, 580.
Saxon Christology. *See* Christology, Saxon.
Saxon consistorial order, 301.
Saxon formulae of subscription, 591, 592.
Saxon order of 1539, 286, 288.
Saxon theologians on Torgau book, 460.
Saxon visitation articles of 1533, 282.
Scandinavian Lutheran synods, 621-622.
Scheele, K. H. G. von.
on the Lutheran symbols, 599.
Schirrmacher, F. W.
on the reading of the Augsburg confession, 89.
Schleiermacher, F. D. E., 571-573.
"Discourses on religion," 571.
Schleswig-Holstein theologians.
and the Concord formula, 500.
Schlüsselburg, Conrad.
on free-will, 367 note.
Schmalkald articles.
prepared by Luther, 270-271.
their relation as symbols, 288.
Schmalkald colloquies, 246-247.
Schmalkald convention of 1529, 122.
Schmalkald convention of 1537, 245, 272.
Schmalkald convention of 1540, 246.
Schmalkald league, 241-245.
and Augsburg confession, 242-243.
von Ranke's opinion on, 242.
Schmid, Heinrich.
"Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche," 585.
Schmidt, Carl.
on authorship of Augsburg confession, 70.
Schmucker, S. S.
on the Symbolical books in the German Lutheran church of America, 605.
Schöpf, J. W.
on authorship of Augsburg confession, 72.
Schubert, Hans von.
on Schwabach articles, 21 note.
Schütz, O. F.
on changes in Torgau book, 480.
Schwabach articles, 9, 21, 29, 61-68.
authorship of, 62.
relation to Elector's confession, 43.
Secret societies, 611, 613.
Seiler, Geryon.
letter to Spalatin on Committee of fourteen, 177-178.
Selneccer, Nicholas, 369, 441-445.
and revision of Torgau book, 470-477.

at Lichtenberg convention, 420-421.
on changes in Torgau book, 479.
on Jacob Andreae, 433.
Works:
Commentary on Genesis, 442.
Institutio religionis Christianae, 405, 442.
Necessary reply to the calumnies of the Flacianists at Altenburg, 444.
Semler, J. S.
and the Symbolical books, 568.
and theological rationalism, 566.
Simmern theologians.
on Torgau book, 455.
Sin, Cause of, 117, 135.
Sin of origin. *See* Original sin.
Sleidanus, Johannes.
on Imperial decree of Augsburg diet, 237.
Soteriological controversy, 386-399.
Spener, P. J., 310, 547-554.
"On academic studies," 553.
on Symbolical books, 553.
on the lack of Biblical study in his time, 532.
preface to John Arndt's Postils, 549.
Spengler, Lazarus.
on Committee of fourteen, 178-179.
Speyer, diet of 1526, 4.
Speyer, diet of 1529, 11-16.
Stahl, F. J.
and New Lutheranism, 584
on the church of Prussia, 576.
Stahl, Julius.
on Concord formula, 488.
Stancar, Francis.
and the Christological controversy, 378-380.
Strassburg confession. *See* Confessio Tetrapolitana, 243.
Strigel Victorin, 358-363.
on conversion, 367.
on free-will in Weimar disputation, 359-363.
"Loci theologici," 368.
Subscription formula of Synodical conference, 613.
Subscription formulae, 538, 591-600.
Supranaturalism, 566.
Synodical statutes of Pomerania, 307.
Swabian Christology. *See* Christology, Swabian.
Swabian Concordia, 412.
Swabian Hall and Augsburg confession, 287.
Swabian-Saxon Concordia, 413.
at Torgau convention, 422.
on free-will, 481.
Sweden and the Lutheran symbols, 598.
Swedish Augustana synod, 621.
Swedish church in America.
and the Lutheran symbols, 601.
Symbolists. *See* Confessionalists.
Symbols. *See* Lutheran symbols.
Syncretistic controversy, 543-545.
Synergistic controversy, 351-371.
See also Free-will, Predestination.
Synod of Pennsylvania. *See* Ministerium of Pennsylvania.
Synodical conference, 612-616.

T

Ten Commandments, as viewed by Andreae, 408.
Theologia irregenitorum, 551-552.
Thomasius, Christian, 559.
"Christi Person und Werk," 585.
Torgau articles, 28, 30-36.
Torgau book, 418-468.
Andreae's epitome of, 469.
censures of, 452-468.
first revision of, 470-473.
precursor of the Concord formula, 424.
second revision of, 473-477.
Torgau confession, 331.
Torgau convention of 1574, 331.
Torgau convention of 1576, 422-425.
Transubstantiation, 153.
in Augsburg confession, 112, 227-229.
in Catholic confutation, 134.
discussed at Naumburg diet, 294, 299.
rejected in Torgau confession, 331.
See also Lord's Supper.
Trinity, 105, 133.
Tschackert, Paul.
Edition of "unaltered" Augsburg confession, 105, 210.
Tübingen book. *See* Swabian Concordia.

U

Ubiquity of Christ.
See Christ, ubiquity of.
United Norwegian Lutheran church, 621.
United synod of the Evangelical Lutheran church in the South, 623.
Universities, German.
founding of, 2.

V

Valdesius, Alphonso.
interviews with Melanchthon, 138.
Valentinians, 105.
Vehus, Hieronymus, 170.
Visitation articles, 8.

Visitation order for Allstedt, 288.
Voluntas beneplaciti, 337.
Voluntas signi, 337.
See also Free-will.
Vows of monks, 160.
in Augsburg confession, 121.
in Catholic confutation, 136.

W

Walch, J. G.
and Pietism, 555.
and the Symbolical books, 555.
on the religious condition of Germany during 17th century, 546.
Waldech order, 308.
Walther, C. F. W., 618-621.
Weber, G. G.
on Augsburg confession, 46-47, 71.
on Latin variata of 1540, 230 note.
Wegscheider, J. A. L.
and rationalism, 567.
"Institutiones theologiae christianae dogmaticae," 567.
Weimar Confutation book of 1559, 358, 401.
Weimar disputation, 358-361.
Wigand, Johann.
on free-will, 365.
on Torgau book, 462.
Will, Free. *See* Free-will.
Wittenberg consistory.
constitution and articles, 286.
Wittenberg jurists.
on Imperial decree of Augsburg diet, 239.
Wittenberg order of 1533, 288.
Wittenberg theologians.
and the Book of Concord, 528.
"Confession and opinion on free-will," 368.
on the Symbolical books, 538.
"Summary of the chief chapters of Christian doctrine taught in the University," 369.
Wittenberg theological faculty.
affirmation of Augsburg confession by candidates for promotion, 283.
and syncretistic controversy, 544.
statutes, relation of, to Augsburg confession, 282.
Wittenberg theses, 1, 6.
Wolff, Christian, 561.
"Theologia naturalis," 562.
Wolfgang, prince of Anhalt, 122.
Works, good. *See* Good works.
Worms, colloquy of 1540, 246-247.
Worms, colloquy of 1557, 229, 290.
Worms, diet of 1557, 328.
Würtemberg order, 287, 309.
Würtemberg theologians.
on Torgau book, 453.

Z

Zeichem, Viglius, 209.
Zelle, convention of, 321.
Zerbst conference of 1570, 403-404.
Zöckler, Otto.
on scheme of Augsburg confession, 102-103.
on the Symbolical books, 588.
Zweibrücken order, 309.
Zweibrücken theologians.
on Torgau book, 455.
Zwingli, Ulrich.
conference with Lutherans at Marburg, 1529, 19.
on the two natures of Christ (alöosis) 373.
Zwinglian influence in Germany, 16-20.
See also Reformed church in Germany.
Zwinglians.
and Augsburg diet, 78.
and the Lord's Supper, 227.

DATE DUE

MAY 20 1994
JUL 14 1994
AUG 15 1995
MAY 22 1995
JAN 23 2002

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.

WITHDRAWN

GTU
00299 9450

BX8018
.R38
Richard, James W.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall